

Capt. Frank Thorp, Fifth Artillery, to be major, January 25, 1901.

First Lieut. John E. McMahon, Fourth Artillery, to be captain, January 25, 1901.

Second Lieut. Fox Conner, Second Artillery, to be first lieutenant, January 25, 1901.

POSTMASTERS.

Lou S. Flournoy, to be postmaster at Ruston, Lincoln Parish, La.

Louise Alvarez, to be postmaster at Covington, St. Tammany Parish, La.

C. J. Howard, to be postmaster at Cottage Grove, Lane County, Oreg.

James S. Thomson, to be postmaster at Lake Charles, Calcasieu Parish, La.

Euphemie Aucoin, to be postmaster at Thibodaux (late Thibodaux), Lafourche Parish, La.

Lorenzo S. Gardner, to be postmaster at Brunswick, Frederick County, Md.

Francis M. Scheble, to be postmaster at Wenatchee, Chelan County, Wash.

Felix R. Bray, to be postmaster at Jackson, Madison County, Tenn.

Berton M. Wooley, to be postmaster at Elsie, Clinton County, Mich.

Hugh W. Parker, to be postmaster at Bancroft, Shiawassee County, Mich.

Austin M. Robinson, to be postmaster at West, McLennan County, Tex.

Andrew W. Mars, to be postmaster at Berrien Springs, Berrien County, Mich.

Justin A. Harsh, to be postmaster at Tekonsha, Calhoun County, Mich.

Alfred S. Follansbee, to be postmaster at Ontonagon, Ontonagon County, Mich.

Richard C. Bullock, to be postmaster at Cherry Creek, Chautauqua County, N. Y.

George W. Armstrong, to be postmaster at Manlius, Onondaga County, N. Y.

Joseph F. Stephens, to be postmaster at Highland Falls, Orange County, N. Y.

Eugene M. Crosswait, to be postmaster at Earlham, Madison County, Iowa.

Oswell Z. Wellman, to be postmaster at Arlington, Fayette County, Iowa.

Marion O. Martin, to be postmaster at Honeoye Falls, Monroe County, N. Y.

Philip M. Mosher, to be postmaster at Riceville, Mitchell County, Iowa.

William W. De Long, to be postmaster at Eddyville, Wapello County, Iowa.

James F. Jordan, to be postmaster at Valley Junction, Polk County, Iowa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, February 5, 1901.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

The Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We come to Thee, O God, in the sacred attitude of prayer, that we may receive that moral and spiritual uplift which shall enable us to go forward with the duties of the day with patience, courage, and fortitude, that we may be in a condition to receive whatever comes to us of joy or sorrow, of pleasure or pain, victory or defeat.

We lift up our hearts in behalf of all who are sick and afflicted of our Congressional family, especially the gentleman from Georgia. We pray Thee that Thou wilt be with him to strengthen him and bring him back to us in health and strength. Hear us and so bless us. In the name of Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE INDIAN RESERVATION, ARIZ.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following House bill with Senate amendments:

H. R. 10899. An act to restore to the public domain a small tract of the White Mountain Apache Indian Reservation, in the Territory of Arizona.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House non-concur in the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed as managers on the part of the House Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHELDEN, and Mr. LITTLE.

JUDICIAL DISTRICTS IN KENTUCKY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 971) to divide Kentucky into two judicial districts, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CANNON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GRIGGS] is recognized.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, in their feverish hunt for big game the American people are about to overlook the "little foxes which may spoil the vine." Present conditions seem to be developing too many statesmen with views encompassing the universe and too few laborers in the field of home. Our glasses are adjusted too well for viewing distant questions and alien peoples for us to be able to see that which is clearly happening every day in our midst. At the risk of being called a small caliber or a smoothbore I propose to ask the House of Representatives to "draw in its sights," at least temporarily, and take a passing glance at domestic concerns wholly disconnected from war and conquest, free from the glamor and glory of world-wide expansion, but fully as dangerous to American institutions. I presume that my remarks will render me persona non grata in several branches of the public service, and I ought to say in the beginning that I have the very highest respect for the office-holding class of American citizens.

I do not refer to that class alone which is elected by the popular vote; that class is but an echo. I refer to the appointive, executive, and departmental class of Government officials; employees, if you please, who are in the main good citizens, honest, earnest, and faithful in the discharge of their duties; and the criticism which I shall make upon some of the fungi which have fastened on the body politic of late years is against the system rather than on individuals. For these people, whether in the Departments at Washington or in the service elsewhere, I say that I have the highest respect, and I regret the necessity of placing myself in what may seem to them a hostile attitude. But when a question like this arises, appealing as I see it to the courage and patriotism of the legislators, it becomes the duty of everyone representing a constituency upon this floor to speak the truth as he sees it.

I concede in the outset that our civil service—and I mean by the term civil service to include all civil employees of the United States—is one of the most efficient, honest, and faithful in the world. Education acquired by long years of experience adds to its efficiency, and undoubtedly every day of service increases the usefulness of the individual employed. Admitting all this, Mr. Chairman, I must, however much I regret the necessity, call the attention of Congress and the country to the imminent danger to our institutions from the great and growing number of organizations of Government employees, every one of which, so far as I am informed, is engaged in an effort to increase the salaries of the members thereof.

There is now a bill before this House—indeed, several bills of like character have been introduced, but I refer in particular to one which has been partially considered—authorizing, in one of the bureaus of one of the great Departments of this Government, the establishment of what is practically a civil pension for the aged and disabled employees of that bureau. It provides that 3 per cent of the salaries of all employees shall be reserved to make a retirement fund, which is to be used to support employees who, by the weight of advancing years or the inroads of disease, may become incapacitated for further service.

Gentlemen insist that this is not a pension. Then I ask them, Mr. Chairman, what is it? If we are paying larger salaries to these employees than are needed, it is our duty to the people that we represent to decrease those salaries in whatever proportion they now exceed just and equitable recompense for service rendered. If they are too small, then it is our duty to our constituencies and to these employees to increase their salaries to an amount commensurate with the labor performed.

On that point, Mr. Chairman, I undertake to say that there is not an employee of this Government who devotes his entire time to its service who does not receive greater pay than he would for like service in private life. There is not an employee in the Government service to-day who did not better his or her condition when he or she entered it. There is not one who, if he could

better his condition to-morrow, would not resign and enter upon other employment.

Then why this paternal interest so often displayed upon this floor in Government employees? All of them are free men and women of full age. Why should we make them wards of the nation? How is this fatherly interest of legislators, so lately aroused in what seems to me a cancerous growth, to be accounted for? It may be, and I believe is, largely due to the unions, associations, and conventions among Government employees of almost every class, organized ostensibly, and probably at the outset really, for the laudable purpose of increasing the efficiency of the service, but every one of which it seems is bound, sooner or later, to degenerate into a society for the purpose of promoting legislation favorable to themselves.

It began, I believe, Mr. Chairman, with a union of employees in the Railway Mail Service, organized at the outset as a purely social and benevolent society, the object of which primarily was to furnish insurance to employees at a lower rate than they could secure it from the regular accident and insurance companies. So far as I am concerned, I have the very highest admiration for the employees in the Railway Mail Service. The employees in that service are in the main patriotic, trustworthy, honest, and in every sense efficient men; and for one I should not be opposed to a reclassification of the service and the payment of salaries commensurate with the labor performed and the dangers endured.

But, Mr. Chairman, this, probably the most efficient branch of the Government service—this, our great army of peace, carrying civilization, enlightenment, and religion throughout all the world to all the people—has no right to organize for the purpose of changing the relation of its employees to the Government which employs them. Let us look at it for a moment. They receive salaries running from \$800 to \$1,400 per annum. They average seven and one-half working hours per day, of which two hours on alternate days are presumed to be devoted to study. The average of salaries paid by the United States to railway postal clerks below the grade of chief clerk is \$1,062.30 per annum—at least a fair salary for seven and a half hours' work per day, two hours of which on alternate days are presumed to be devoted to the study of their work.

I constantly receive letters headed like this:

National Association of Railway Postal Clerks.

Then usually follows a list of committees, chief among which in every instance is the "legislative committee." A position on this committee seems to be as much sought after in those organizations as a position on the Ways and Means or Appropriations Committee in this House.

I quote:

Our bill has passed the Senate.

Our bill!

Our bill has passed the Senate a number of times, to be ignored a hearing by Tom Reed, ex-Speaker, etc., at various sessions. Let me assure you the bill is an honest one, or it would not have the indorsement of the Department, which it has.

I do not doubt that these gentlemen are honest in their intentions; I do not doubt that their bill is an honest bill; but I do doubt—I do deny—the propriety, the right of employees, in whatever branch of the service they may be engaged and however efficient their services may be, to organize and demand legislation of any character at the hands of Congress.

Here is another:

Resolutions adopted by railway postal clerks, Louisville, Ky., April 16, 1900.

This is a protest against an effort of the Post-Office Committee to reclassify the service to a certain extent a year ago. Those who send us these resolutions say that the reclassification as attempted by the Post-Office Committee benefited but a few of the clerks, without any reference to its benefit to the service.

Signed by a committee—signed by a president—signed by a secretary.

And here, Mr. Chairman, is another, to which I wish to call your attention:

Hon. JAMES M. GRIGGS, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

This is dated Chicago, December 3, 1900, and is in the following language:

As representatives of the 9,000 railway postal clerks in the United States, we again solicit your assistance in our efforts to obtain legislation for the benefit of the Railway Mail Service and the employees thereof. * * *

Now, Mr. Chairman, whatever might have been the object of the society at the very beginning—at its inception—however laudable its purposes and intentions might have been, it has at last come to a point where the sole business and the sole purpose and function of the association seem to be the promotion of legislation before Congress beneficial to the members of the association.

What would you say, gentlemen, to an organization of American soldiers in the Philippine Islands sending their representatives here to demand an increase of their pay? Two years ago an American army was encamped in the island of Cuba. They had

just won a victory which ended a war. Unaccustomed to the torrid climate, that dread scourge of the Tropics—yellow fever—was stalking a veritable pestilence through the camp. Something was necessary to be done. The necessity for action—speedy action—was urgent.

Finally it was decided to frame and forward a protest against remaining longer there to the Commander in Chief of the Armies of the United States, the President of the United States. How was that accomplished? No officer in all of that army, not even the terror of the Western mountain lions—the strenuous Vice-President-elect of the United States—dared sign his name first, and thus assume responsibility for this act. It was finally signed in a complete circle, without beginning and without end, and this is the famous "round robin" of the American Army, and the secret of its existence.

No private soldier would have dared to do even this. This protest came from soldiers, from men whose lives were in the balance, and whose health was dependent, as they believed, on their removal from that death-dealing climate.

The American civil employees, in no danger from anything, according to gentlemen who advocate pensions and increases of pay for him, except old age and his own extravagance, organizes and sends a walking delegate here to interview Congress in his behalf. The soldier, having faced death in battle and a thousandfold worse from disease, must remain mute.

I am, Mr. Chairman, in receipt, and every member of the Post-Office Committee is in a like condition, constantly of communications headed "National Letter-Carriers' Association," "Association of Railway Mail Clerks," "Associated Post-Office Clerks," and associated clerks of all sorts and sizes, kinds, and descriptions, signed by some official as secretary or president, or both as secretary and president, insisting that his particular branch of the public service should be reclassified or equalized. Everyone of them insists upon equalizing up and not one of them on equalizing down. It does not seem ever to have occurred to them that this equalization or classification might go both ways. They do not seem to appreciate the fact that it might go up or might go down. They all want it equalized the same way. They always insist on leveling up.

Now, I do not undertake to say, Mr. Chairman, that the letter carriers of the United States are not entitled to an equalization of their service. I am not now discussing that question. But I do undertake to say that no employee, be he a letter carrier or a railway mail clerk, has the right to enter into a union to force legislation through this body.

Let us look at the work of the letter carriers for a moment. They average about seven and a half hours' work a day and receive from \$600 to \$1,000 salary per annum. They also receive fifteen days' leave of absence during the year. The average salary of the letter carrier employed in the service of the United States is \$903.96. That is a fair compensation, at least, Mr. Chairman, for messenger service, for that is what it is, neither more nor less. To equalize them as urged would add \$3,741,350 annually to the Post-Office appropriation bill.

As I have said, \$900 per annum is at least fair pay for messenger service. They insist, however, that the class of men in the service are worth more than this, their average salary. If so, let them get out of the service and make it elsewhere. If they are worth it, it could be easily done. This salary brought them into the service; let its inadequacy take them out of it. I have so many letters from carriers that it would be useless to take up the time of the House to read them to you. I propose to read you, however, just a few extracts on this line. I am going to read you first from the letter of the president of the Carriers' Association in the United States to the members of the association in the April number, 1900, of the Postal Record:

Our members should bear in mind this fact, that at this time and in this particular stage of our affairs there is very little time to spare in discussing with our members anything pertaining to our work here—

That is, in Washington—

feeling that it will be time enough after the matter has been disposed of to inform you in detail everything connected with the affair. Just now our talk, both through the columns of the Postal Record and through our friends at home, and through their friends whom they can reach, should be directed to the members of Congress from their respective districts, and their talk with them should be plain and to the point; that we know no reason why this salary bill should not be placed upon the statute books, and we are in no humor of being jollied any longer by lame excuses as to why this has not been done. For myself, I but want to reiterate to you the statement made at our Scranton convention, and to the carrying out of which our organization has been pledged—that if we can not pass the increase of salary bill at this session of Congress, there is no hope of ever passing it; and I again assure you that I will have no excuse to offer and will endeavor to inform you as to just where the responsibility should be placed.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. GRIGGS. With pleasure.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. What is the date of that?

Mr. GRIGGS. April, 1900.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Last year?

Mr. GRIGGS. Yes. This is a copy of the Postal Record, published by the Carriers' Association of the United States in the city of Washington, edited by a gentleman by the name of Cantwell. This is the letter of the president of that association, Mr. Parsons, to the members thereof, written in April, 1900.

Mr. HEDGE. Written here in Washington.

Mr. GRIGGS. Written, I presume, from Washington; yes. I have another one here. When we have representatives of these associations before our committee advocating their legislation, the question has been asked of some of them, "Do you never threaten members of Congress for their opposition?" to which every member of the Post-Office Committee will remember the reply always made is "Never." If what I have read is not a threat, a public and direct threat, of a determination to do something to such members as will not comply with their demands, then no court on earth ever was able or ever will be able to determine what is a threat in any criminal matter that may come before it.

Let me read you a very unique, the most unique paper I have ever received in connection with all these matters. It is a parallel column of comparisons between the post-office clerks and the carriers. These gentlemen are all nice gentlemen, they are men of sense and ability, they are all men who know how to approach you in a gentlemanly way, and they know how to jolly you when it is necessary, to compliment you when it is necessary, and they know when to stay away from you. They are good fellows. I know all of them, and I have heard some of them say that they could not understand how the post-office clerks would make such an attack as this upon their brethren who are engaged in the same business; that is, I presume, the business of promoting legislation increasing salaries. Here is the comparison in parallel columns between the two classes of employees.

LETTER CARRIER.

1. *Protection.*—Protected by laws of the most positive and mandatory character, passed by Congress.

2. *Salaries.*—Salaries fixed and determined by length of service.

First year	\$600
Second year	800
Third year	1,000

No deviation is possible from the above time and amounts.

3. *Working hours.*—Eight (8) hours (no more, under penalty of suspension) constitute a day's work.

4. *Punishment.*—Carriers are suspended (that is, they are given a holiday without pay).

5. *Requirements of duty.*—To learn one district, no study off duty. No examinations. An intelligent man could serve a district in some fashion the first day in the service. An ordinary district could be well learned in a month.

6. *Health.*—Subject to exposure in severe weather.

Healthful occupation physically, with but few exceptions.

7. *Vacations.*—The law requires that every carrier shall be given fifteen days' vacation a year. A substitute is provided during said vacation and paid out of money provided for that purpose.

POST-OFFICE CLERK.

1. *Protection.*—Unprotected by law; salaries and positions regulated by Post-Office Department, or at the will of local postmaster.

2. *Salaries.*—Salaries not regulated by any rule, but generally dealt out according to amount of influence the clerk can bring to bear on the postmaster.

First year, \$300, \$400, \$500, or \$600. Second year, sometimes less than first.

No certainty of increase. Can be kept at above amounts or raised to \$1,400, or can be reduced from \$1,400 to \$600, or any amount between the two.

3. *Working hours.*—Eight, nine, ten, or twelve hours, as superintendents see fit to exact, constitute a day's work.

4. *Punishment.*—Clerks are fined (that is, they are obliged to work without pay).

5. *Requirements of duty.*—To learn all districts in a city, or all post-offices in a State or the United States. Postal laws; constant study to keep abreast of changes. Yearly or semi-yearly examinations. It is impossible for a new man to do the work in any manner the first day. Six months of practice and study required to make an ordinary clerk.

6. *Health.*—Protected from the weather. Physically the work of the clerk is much more exhausting to the system. Mentally there is no comparison.

7. *Vacations.*—The postmaster may or may not grant the clerk fifteen days' vacation; no compulsion whatever. A great many clerks never receive a day's vacation, on account of insufficient force to allow such privilege. When the clerk is granted a vacation there is no substitute provided in his place, but the balance of the regular force must do the work between themselves.

Every man who comes here with a bill always calls it "our bill." One of these carriers has gone so far, something in the sunny clime of Georgia has so affected him mentally—whether or not it is the sap that rises on the brain in the springtime or something else I know not—but this carrier has gone off into poetry on the subject. I read it:

A TOAST TO THE BOYS IN GRAY.

Sung to the tune of "The Old Crow Crossed the Road."

Here's a health, boys in gray,
Wherever you may be found!
Maine, California, Texas, Iowa—
Here's to you, drink 'er down.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. That is moonshine.

Mr. GRIGGS (reading)—

Here's a health, boys in gray,
A-hopin' for twelve hundred a year.
All the same, short pay or long pay,
You'll allus be busted, I fear.

Here's a health, boys in gray!
Hope you'll be here many a Monday,
And I'll never miss a single day,
And never fail to punch old Bundy.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Do you not think it is moonshine down there?

Mr. GRIGGS. Possibly; they say they make it good down there. Mr. Chairman, we are constantly in receipt of communications from post-office clerks in the United States, a body organized for what declared purpose I know not. I presume from the circular just read that the carriers think for attack upon them, which might be called one trust attacking another. For what declared purpose they have organized, I say, I have been unable to ascertain; but they insist as an organization that they shall be protected by a change of the law and an increase of salary. These post-office clerks, if anybody has a case before Congress, have the best case of any. They work more hours and receive on the average less pay than the employees in any other branch of the postal service.

What next? I presume members of this House on the Post-Office Committee besides myself have seen dropped gently in front of them from the hands of the doorkeeper often here a little card with a name on it, and following the name "President of the Association of Fourth-class Postmasters of the United States, 70,000 strong."

Mr. LOUD. Seventy thousand votes.

Mr. GRIGGS. And 70,000 strong they have been marching on Congress since its organization, about two years ago. I know they have grievances, Mr. Chairman; but we all have grievances, and Congress was never established as a panacea for grievances of governmental employees or anybody else, except the grievances and the wrongs of the people of the country at large. It grieves me to have to pay at a hotel in the city of Washington twice as much board as my secretary would have to pay for the same service and the same attention. That, I presume, is one of the penalties of greatness, however, and I accept it as such and uncomplainingly pay it.

A large majority of the fourth-class post-offices were established only as a convenience for the people of the neighborhood; and almost every merchant in the small villages of the country would gladly undertake the work of the office for nothing, on account of the increased trade it would bring to them. A great many of these post-offices were established for the benefit of the postmaster himself, who has a country store, and wishes, besides receiving his own mail, to gain the trade the post-office naturally brings.

Mr. William H. Thomas is the president of this national league—I called it "association." I apologize to the gentleman for it, "League!" They all have different names.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. GRIGGS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman had called to his attention a recent copy of a confidential circular sent out by Mr. Thomas?

Mr. GRIGGS. I do not know; I have had so many. I will say to my friend from Illinois I have received so many circulars of all sorts and sizes that I have not made even an effort to keep up with them.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit me, one of the fourth-class postmasters in my district, and I have not very many, sent me this circular, which I hold in my hand.

Mr. GRIGGS. I do not want to be discourteous to my friend—

Mr. MANN. I think it will help you.

Mr. HOPKINS. It is the line you are discussing, and we will give you an extension of time.

Mr. GRIGGS. All right.

Mr. MANN. This circular includes this paragraph, that seems to throw a great deal of light on Mr. Thomas's occupation:

There is no fund on hand to cover expenses. If you wish me to go, please send one or two dollars, which will be entered as a credit on your dues to the national league.

Mr. GRIGGS. I was coming to that, but not in that way. I am glad my friend from Illinois has called my attention to it. I understood that their dues were a dollar a year, but I think it started out with the idea of \$5 dues.

Mr. MANN. It strikes me as one way of defrauding the poor people in the country for the purpose of robbing them of their money. It beats the green-goods game all to pieces. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRIGGS. A line here, which he prints in big black letters nearly a foot square, is this: "Now, look yourself fairly in the face and answer these questions." From having seen the president of this association, I believe he is a man who could come nearer doing what he advises the fourth-class postmaster to do than any man I ever saw.

I read further:

Isn't this a violation of a contract by the Government? And isn't your claim for the return of this money righteous and just?

This money they claim from the Government is what they claim to have lost by their failure at some time to have the privilege of canceling the stamps on letters mailed possibly on the train, possibly at some other post-office not fourth-class. He is a pretty clever sort of a fellow, however, and he makes three or four propositions to us on the same sheet of paper. Like the boy who went to town with the eggs to sell, he said, "Dad told me to ask you 20 cents a dozen, and if you would not give that to take 15." He first comes with a proposition that would take a million dollars per annum out of the Treasury, and he comes next with the proposition to take \$375,000, and says if you can not give us the million, give us the \$375,000. I presume, having been unable to get there, he has adopted the plan suggested by my friend from Illinois and gone out on a raid on the fourth-class postmasters.

Do not talk to me about fourth-class postmasters' hardships. I am too well acquainted with them and their work. I have many friends among them, but I do say they are the best paid men for the work they do in all this land. But I am not now discussing the question of salaries or pay or of hardships of employees. The proposition which I wish I could make clear to every taxpayer in this land is this—that employees of this Government, agents of the people, supported by the people, have no right to organize as against the legislative agents of the same people for whom they are performing service, and who pay the taxes by which they are sustained.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GRIGGS. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. What particular employees have effected an organization such as the gentleman describes?

Mr. GRIGGS. I am sorry my friend came in so late, or did not listen after he did come in. I have enumerated each class as I came along.

Mr. TAWNEY. Post-office clerks and letter carriers?

Mr. GRIGGS. And the railway mail clerks.

Mr. TAWNEY. Do you mean to say that the railway mail clerks have an organization like that you describe? If you do, I want to correct you. It is a benevolent association. It has not been used for the purpose you describe, and by a resolution adopted at the last convention there has been no fund raised for the purpose of prosecuting any legislation affecting the railway postal clerks of the United States.

Mr. GRIGGS. Then what does this mean?

CHICAGO, ILL., December 31, 1900.

DEAR SIR: As representatives of the 9,000 railway postal clerks of the United States, we again solicit your assistance in order to obtain legislation for the benefit of the railway mail service and employees therein.

C. L. SCHAEFFER, President.

Hon. JAMES M. GRIGGS,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. TAWNEY. No person disputes the proposition that they have written letters. Would you deny an employee the right that any citizen has to write a letter to a Representative in Congress?

Mr. GRIGGS. No, sir, I would not; I would not deny the right of petition to any American citizen. I would not even deny it to a Filipino. But I do deny the right of officials employed by this Government to organize for the purpose of forcing or influencing any sort of legislation in this body.

Mr. TAWNEY. The letter which you read, written by the president of the association, does not prove your statement, so far as it relates to the railway postal clerks, because there is no evidence in the letter that the association was formed for the purpose of influencing legislation in its behalf.

Mr. GRIGGS. My friend says it does not prove what I claim. I hope I have in this House and in the people of the United States a more impartial if not a more intelligent jury to pass upon this question than is my friend from Minnesota. I did not say—and if my friend had paid attention to my remarks or had been present and listened to them—I did not say the organization of the railway mail clerks was formed for the purpose of influencing legislation. I said it was formed as a benevolent association and I stated the purpose for which it was formed, that of furnishing insurance to its members, but I said it had of late years degenerated into a society for the purpose of influencing legislation in their behalf. That is what I said; and if this letter does not prove that, then I do not know what proof is.

Mr. TAWNEY. One other question, if the gentleman pleases. Does he object to the heads of Departments asking Congress for the legislation which the railway postal clerks are asking for?

Mr. GRIGGS. The Departments?

Mr. TAWNEY. The Postmaster-General, the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, and the Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service.

Mr. GRIGGS. No.

Mr. TAWNEY. Are they not asking Congress for the same legislation that the railway postal clerks are asking; and do they

constitute an organization for the purpose of influencing legislation?

Mr. GRIGGS. Is my friend through?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRIGGS. One of the duties of the Postmaster-General is to advise Congress as to the legislation needed in his Department; and if my friend will point out to me one line of law which names as any duty of any employee under him in the Post-Office Department to advise Congress, I will apologize for all I have said and vote with the gentleman to raid the Treasury in all directions.

As I was going on to say when my friend from Minnesota interrupted me, gentlemen may ask whether I propose to deny to these employees the right of petition guaranteed them under the Constitution. (I presume that the "Constitution follows" these fellows, no matter where they may go.) I would not deny them any right, Mr. Chairman. If they have grievances, if they suffer wrongs which they wish to have redressed, let them petition Congress as individuals, as free men, not as bound members of an association or society which is entirely foreign to the spirit of our institutions. An employee is an official just as much as the head of a bureau or department is. He is an officer of this Government just as a Senator or Member of Congress is. We are all on the firing line, and under our oaths it is the duty of all of us to stand for the interest of the people. It is not our duty as members of Congress to stand for the interest of that body of which we are members; it is not the duty of a Senator to look out for the interests of the Senate, but to fight for the interests of all the people—the people who "pay the freight."

Let me say here that I am not opposed to labor unions, trade federations, and the like. Under modern conditions, with great aggregations of capital in the hands of soulless corporations, these combinations of labor seem a necessity. So long as the contest was man against man, everyone could protect himself, be he laborer or be he capitalist. But since it has come to a condition in which dollars herd together and the man is no longer able alone to stand against them, it is perfectly proper for laborers to organize themselves against the tyranny of congested capital.

But what of the Government official, Mr. Chairman? Against whom does he organize? Is he organized against capital? He is organized against supposed oppression or wrong somewhere. He is necessarily organized against the Government of the United States. The Government is merely the agent of the people. He is not only himself one of the agents of the people, but he is one of the people. Whenever such organized effort is made by Government employees to bring pressure on Congress for the purpose of changing their relations to the Government, they are engaged in an effort to coerce not only Congress, but the people of the United States. That which would be denounced as treason and conspiracy on the part of soldiers is commended as a patriotic effort to redress wrongs on the part of civil employees.

The great body of the people, Mr. Chairman, do not draw from the Treasury of this Government for their support; on the contrary, the Treasury draws on their resources, and they must pay the draft. Should the entire officeholding class become organized into a great body of salary grabbers, making its annual demands on Congress, it would not be a case of the labor union protecting its members against the aggressions of capital; it would be rather the aggregation of capital oppressing labor. It would be the salaried man against the unsalaried man, who must meet whatever demands the Government makes upon him. Once in two years only has he the opportunity of declaring his approval or disapproval of our acts. The Government employee is perennial in his demands. He is an ever-blooming rose, Mr. Chairman.

There are about 300,000 employees in this Government. If once thoroughly organized and voting solidly, they could turn the scales in any Presidential election. In almost every Congressional district in the United States an active organization of Government employees may be able now to turn the scales at every election. Suppose it should come to this, Mr. Chairman, where would the free representatives of the American people stand? Instead of being, as they have always boasted themselves to be, free and independent representatives of a free people, they would come here bound hand and foot, the mere puppets of organized officeholders.

We are seeking to extend the benefits of rural mail delivery over the United States. The extension of this service has been to me a labor of love since I have had the honor to sit in this House. It is due to some of my friends in the House and to the creator of the latest Republican platform that I should disclaim any pretension to the fatherhood of this service. I am content with playing the benevolent stepfather. But, Mr. Chairman, when I look forward to the time when in every county in every Congressional district of this country there will be from 10 to 100 mail carriers organized into a vast body 150,000 strong, ostensibly for the purpose of increasing the efficiency of the service, but really working day and night to increase the salaries of themselves and to fight

the Representative who will not bow to their behests, I see danger to American institutions.

My hope is, Mr. Chairman, that the strong common sense and patriotism of the American people, which has stood them in good stead during so many crises in the past, may be aroused before that day comes, and that these organizations which, whatever their original purpose, incidentally or accidentally degenerate into organizations for the purpose of increasing salaries will be crushed out, and that every man in the service, as well as out of it, may stand upon his own bottom, and that his highest hope and his highest ambition will be, whether in or out of office, to be a free and independent liberty-loving American citizen. As a sentinel on the watchtower, I simply call attention to the threatened danger. The people themselves must apply the remedy.

All classes of postmasters in the United States are now organized into what they call a convention for the alleged purpose of increasing the efficiency of the service. They got up too high to be "a league" or "an association," but have organized "a convention," and they have favored the Department with their photographs. We have all seen photographs of the last convention hanging around in the city of Washington. They are organized for an alleged purpose of increasing, as are all, the efficiency of the service. Why, Mr. Chairman, such an organization of postmasters is an absolute absurdity. Just consider for a moment! I have noticed in the newspapers as one of the resolutions adopted by this convention an indorsement of the St. Louis fair, a most laudable enterprise, but, as I understand it, totally disconnected from the Post-Office Department of the United States or from the postal service in any way.

Another resolution which I understand was adopted was one favoring the extension of the pneumatic-tube service—a service which, if continued at all, will necessarily and naturally be confined to a few of the largest cities and a service about which the postmasters throughout the country generally have neither the time nor the means of obtaining information of any character. A union of carpenters is a union of men of a certain class of citizens who are performing their life work. It is their trade, undertaken by them in their young manhood, for the promotion of an interest by which they propose to provide for themselves and their families throughout life. They are organized into a union to protect their trade and to protect themselves. But what of an association of postmasters? Why, it would be an anomaly. The postmaster, as my friend from New Haven sitting opposite to me [Mr. SPERRY] can probably testify—the postmaster is a peripatetic individual, who lingers during the lifetime of the Administration which appoints him.

His life is like the summer rose
That opens to the morning sky,
But ere the shades of evening close
Is scattered on the ground—to die.

[Laughter.]

He might start to a convention as a member thereof, aye, even as the president of the convention, and find himself on arrival at the place of meeting a last year's bird's nest, as I am credibly informed one president found himself not long ago, ex officio, and without any functions of any kind. One swing of the official ax here would accomplish this end.

I hold in my hand some of their resolutions. Here they are. Members can see them. It is a national association, as we are informed, and I beg to call your attention to certain proposed legislation in the alleged interests of the postal service of the United States. In order to catch the chairman of the Post-Office Committee at the outset (but I may pause to say that they did not get him; he is too cunning an old fox to be caught in that way) [laughter] they began on abuses in second-class mail matter, the "Loud bill."

Why, Mr. Chairman, I can see those postmasters now as they passed their resolutions, their countenances beaming and their hearts overflowing with good feeling toward the whole world and especially toward themselves. They said: "Now we have got Loud. We are ready to proceed; we are all right. We will go on and accomplish the 'reforms' that we have in mind." The next thing they do is to resolute on appropriations for clerk hire. The next is an emergency appropriation for the interest of the service. The next resolution is for the eight-hour law. They are working too hard and working too long. The next is with reference to the mail-wagon service, and so they go on through the entire list. They recommend that the regulations be so changed with reference to biddings and contracts that they shall be restricted to persons residing on the line of the route.

Mr. LOUD. Trying to catch all classes.

Mr. GRIGGS. Trying to catch everybody. Well, I presume as they found that they did not catch the chairman, and they did not catch the "other boys," they have decided to let recommendations to Congress alone. I hope so, and I may be permitted to say that this is a most laudable determination on their part.

A MEMBER. They seem to have caught TAWNEY. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRIGGS. Well, I do not know about that.

But, Mr. Chairman, what has been said in reference to postmasters may be said of a great many of the postal clerks—I mean the post-office clerks. The civil service gives practically a life tenure to letter carriers, railway mail clerks, Department clerks, and to that extent their office is their trade. The postmaster, on the other hand, may be a private citizen to-morrow, and because of the constant change in the personnel of this office his organization can not become a very dangerous menace to American institutions.

But, Mr. Chairman, should all officeholders at last go under civil-service rules, with a life tenure on their offices, and finally become organized into a great body of salary grabbers, 500,000 strong, I would tremble for the safety of the Government of this Republic.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MONDELL). The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GRIGGS] be allowed to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIGGS. I thank my friend from Illinois and the House for the courtesy, and will be pleased to answer the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania if I can.

Mr. MAHON. I have listened to the gentleman very attentively in his argument, and I agree with a great deal of it. Now, I ask him to answer this question: There was a bill here for the codification of the postal laws. If this evil exists and is growing, why did not the committee put in your codification provisions prohibiting things of this sort, making them cause for dismissal?

Mr. GRIGGS. I will tell my friend why we did not do that. A recodification of the postal laws was a necessity. Speedy action was necessary. It had been so long since the laws had been codified that it was necessary for us to act on the subject at once, and the committee agreed that it would be impossible if we went into all the abuses we thought existed in this Department, because we could not go into one without going into all; that the bill would die aborning, and we would still be without the needed codification of the postal laws.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him, while he is thus diverted from the course of his remarks?

Mr. GRIGGS. With pleasure. Always go right ahead with any questions you wish to ask.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman does not touch upon it anywhere else in his speech, I should like to ask him what is the effect of the civil-service laws in protecting employees of the Government and their organizations for the purpose of increasing salaries? In other words, if they were not protected, would they form these organizations?

Mr. GRIGGS. I am going to give my opinion on that, but I can answer the question now. I think the civil service of the United States is the greatest humbug of all the ages. That is my opinion of that.

I repeat, the postmaster of to-day is a private citizen to-morrow, and because of constantly changing personnel his league can not become very dangerous to American institutions. But, Mr. Chairman, should all officeholders at last get under the civil-service rules with a life tenure on their offices, and finally become organized into a great body of salary grabbers, I would tremble for the safety of this Republic.

I represent here farmers, merchants, lawyers, mechanics, traders, bankers, preachers, doctors. I represent also railway mail clerks, postmasters, post-office clerks, and letter carriers. The pay of every class of these officeholders is far better than that of the average private citizen. Should the representative of all be controlled by the organization of the few? I am perfectly willing to admit that there are inequalities in every branch of the Government service. I am willing to admit for the sake of argument that members of the service in every section thereof have many wrongs, but, Mr. Chairman, I insist that the resignation door is wide open always to all who can not be pleased with the offices they hold. [Applause.]

There are inequalities here. I sometimes find myself tolerated where my friend from California [Mr. LOUD] is most welcome. That is not my fault, but his good fortune, and I do not envy him in it, and I shall not make an effort to organize a convention in order to make me as welcome in certain parts of the city of Washington as my friend from California is. There are inequalities between members of this House and members of the other body at the other end of this building. When I was a private citizen I thought a judge of the circuit court was the grandest man on earth. That was about as far as I had seen. I afterwards aspired to the judgeship, and the bench fell to my level. After association with circuit judges for a number of years, I found

that a judge of the circuit court in Georgia was no bigger man than any other citizen of Georgia, except possibly the member of Congress. I aspired to that, and reached this, to me, high goal. Since associating with members here from every State and every corner of the Union, I find that a member of Congress is no better than the average citizen of Georgia and no bigger than the average citizen of Georgia, and I have at last arrived at the conclusion that the Presidency of the United States is not as grand and great an office as I used to think it was. But left alone in grand and gloomy glory, the Senator of the United States yet remains the superior of everybody on God's green earth except some other Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Has the gentleman aspirations in that direction?

Mr. GRIGGS. I am not going to resign from the House, and I am not going to organize this House into an association for the purpose of promoting legislation to make a member of the House as good as a Senator, because my honest opinion is that all truly good members of the House finally land in the Senate, if they live long enough. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, if these gentlemen can not be pleased, if these employees do not like it, then, as was once said by a distinguished Georgian, "If they do not like the taste, let them pour it back in the jug," and we will find some one else who will gladly take up the task they thus lay down.

Mr. MAHON. A Georgian never does that. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRIGGS. I think he felt perfectly safe that his advice would not be acted on, just as I do to-day. Labor organizes to protect the individual, and no man questions its right. Office-holders, liable to go out with every passing breeze of public opinion, unite not for the purpose of protecting man against oppression, but to advance themselves and their interests against the rights and interests of the people, the owners of the offices. They organize to tax the people for the benefit of offices which may be filled by them to-day and others to-morrow. If given the opportunity, I would undertake to fill every Government office with competent men who would be willing to accept the salaries now paid and who would enter into a solemn agreement to join no society or organization which has for its object, either directly or indirectly, incidentally or accidentally, intentionally or unintentionally, the increase of salaries.

It makes me tired, Mr. Chairman, to listen to sympathetic twaddle over "men grown gray in the Government service." It is said that it is impossible to get rid of many who, after long service, borne down by the weight of advancing years and the inroads of disease, have become incapacitated for efficient service. My sympathies go out, Mr. Chairman, to every man in office and out of office who, stricken in years, is unable to perform the service necessary for his sustenance. But, Mr. Chairman, at the same time my mind reverts to the great body of citizens throughout the United States who labor day in and day out from year to year and who must depend upon the uncertainties of the weather, the rains and the sunshine, who must work in the cold and in the heat, and who find themselves, after long years of service, unable to further labor and yet without a competency. Where does their pension come from, Mr. Chairman? A great majority of these have a smaller yearly income than even the very lowest salary paid by the Government, and yet we are told that in order to protect Government employees from their own extravagance, and in order to protect the Government from imposition from incompetent servants, we must not only pay higher salaries, but we must take from their salaries a certain per cent for an insurance fund and set this great Government out on a career of life and annuity insurance; all of it the direct result, to my mind, of these organizations of employees. Let us look for a moment at this proposed civil pension. We are told that it will come from the salary of the employee and that the Government will simply hold it as trustee to pay it out in the terms of the law.

Who pays the salaries but the Government? Who furnishes the money but the people? Besides, Mr. Chairman, who will dare stand upon this floor and promise the people of the United States that these very employees will not soon again, through their organizations, urge upon Congress an increase of salaries? What will they say? They will say to Congress, "You paid us at one time so much salary. You said by law that we were entitled to it. You said it was necessary for our maintenance and support. You have now taken 3, 4, or 5 per cent of that salary and have by so much reduced our income. True, you have a retirement fund which theoretically belongs to us, but that does not supply present necessities. If we would enjoy that fund, we must live; if we would live, we must have our salaries." The pressure would come and then we would see the ridiculous spectacle of Congress dancing in response to the demands of organized politicians and hurrying to raise salaries by the same or on a larger percentage than the percentage of reduction by means of which the retirement fund was established.

The first step renders the second easy. The history of legisla-

tion in the United States bears me out in this assertion. In fact, all legislation the world over testifies to its truth. The fact that every branch of the postal service is now organized, standing at the door of Congress clamoring for increases of salaries under the guise of "reclassification," "equalization," and other harmless and innocent terms, warns us that the time has come to lay the hand of prohibition on such organizations. The history of the pension legislation of the United States is warning sufficient for reasonable men. One step at a time has increased the pension list from an estimated cost of thirty millions to one hundred and forty millions, and the end is not yet. In fact, Mr. Chairman, the entire history of the American people, the increase of offices, the increase of salaries in all of these offices, from the beginning until now, warns us to stop where we are. I have heard gentlemen speak eloquently of the employee who, having "grown gray" in the service of the Government, has been at last in his old age "turned out to graze."

This is a sentimental picture, Mr. Chairman, and I doubt not almost brings tears to the eyes of the would-be civil pensioner who sees or hears it. Let me give you a practical picture. Consider the fact as stated by me before in these remarks—and I defy contradiction—that every one of these employees bettered his financial condition when he entered the Government service and that every one would resign to-day and become a private citizen if by so doing he could better his present condition. If this be true, instead of commiserating with this "poor unfortunate class," we ought to congratulate them upon their great good fortune in having had the opportunity of entering the service of the Government. "Grown gray" in the service, have they? I see men all around me who have grown gray in the public service and who have fought for their lives every second year since entering political life. For their defeat and retirement to private life not a tear will fall from friend or foe. I see men around me in this House who in a few days will retire to private life unwept and unsung, but not, I hope, unhonored. And when it comes time for me, as it must come in the life of every man in public life, to drink of the bitter cup of defeat I must not only drink it amid the jeers and cheers of my opponents, but must take it with apparent relish.

Grown gray feeding at the public crib, the Government officials who are appointed to office must be protected from the people, who support them, their salaries fixed to suit them on demand, and at last pensioned by Congress. Ah, Mr. Chairman, rather than commiserate with the dancers, let us commiserate with the people who must pay the fiddlers. If a kind Providence and a beneficent Government have permitted them to "grow gray in the Government service," with salaries far greater than are paid for the same services in private life, they should thank God for the opportunity to lay up something for the evening of life, and be ready to stand aside with a competency for themselves, saved without compulsion, when, by reason of age, they have become incompetent. The Government employee is no less a man by reason of his employment.

Gentlemen say that incompetents can not be got rid of under the present system. If the civil service is to be continued, Mr. Chairman, why not let us fix an age limit and let it be inflexible. A better plan still has been suggested, I believe, by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR]. Let there be a fixed tenure of office, beyond which no man, whether influential or not, shall be permitted to serve. There are thousands, yea, millions, of our fellow-countrymen who, although not in office, have "grown gray" in the service of their country on less than the smallest salary paid by the Government to its lowest employee. Every day, worn and weary with life's hard struggle, they lie down in their graves without ever having had the opportunity to lay up something with which to even decently put them away. Why should they be taxed that a special, petted class shall be built up, rendered secure of their offices while in health and cared for by the Government in their days of inefficiency? It is the unsalaried man, the man without office, the man without a pension, and without hope of one, the unorganized man, if you please, for whom I speak to-day. Instead of increasing his burden, I would lighten it, in order that, free and unfettered in life's race, he may have every opportunity to reach the highest ideal of citizenship. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CUNNINGHAM, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the following title:

H. R. 8814. An act to provide for the entry of lands formerly in Lower Brule Indian Reservation, S. Dak.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

House concurrent resolution No. 70.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a joint committee consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary

arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice-President of the United States on the 4th day of March, next.

With the following amendment:

In lines 8 and 9 strike out "and Vice-President."

INAUGURATION ARRANGEMENTS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the concurrent resolution H. C. Res. 70 with a Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, this will now be considered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced as the members of the joint committee on the part of the House the following: Mr. CANNON of Illinois, Mr. DALZELL of Pennsylvania and Mr. McRAE of Arkansas.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

[Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HOPKINS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On January 31, 1901:

H. R. 4333. An act granting a pension to John Calvin Lane.

On February 1, 1901:

H. R. 428. An act to amend the law establishing a port of delivery at Des Moines, Iowa;

H. R. 4728. An act providing for leaves of absence to certain employees of the Government; and

H. R. 11785. An act to provide for the construction of a bridge by the Fargo, Duluth and Northwestern Railroad Company across the Red River of the North at Fargo, N. Dak.

On February 4, 1901:

H. R. 12281. An act to amend section 3255 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, concerning the distilling of brandy from fruits;

H. R. 4910. An act to establish a lobster hatchery in the State of Maine;

H. R. 533. An act to correct the military record of George J. Titcomb; and

H. R. 4020. An act for the relief of William Burke.

On February 5, 1901:

H. R. 9762. An act directing the issue of a duplicate of a lost check drawn by E. B. Atwood, lieutenant-colonel and deputy quartermaster-general, United States Army, in favor of Alfred C. Case.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of this bill there were three items reserved for the general debate: First, the pneumatic-tube service; second, the question of the pay for mail transportation by the railroads; and third, the special-facilities subsidy. I shall touch but briefly upon the first two of these, and devote a little more time and attention to the third.

The pneumatic-tube service, as the House is aware, has been largely an experimental service in three of the large cities of the country—Boston, Philadelphia, and New York. Perhaps I should say four large cities, because the New York service reaches to Brooklyn. Each year for a number of years past we have made an appropriation for the expedition of the mails by the pneumatic tube.

Year after year the question has come up in the Post-Office Committee whether the expedition of the mails through these tubes was at all commensurate with the expense of maintaining the service. The committee this year decided, and largely upon the report of the postal commission who investigated this subject, that the slight expedition, the slight saving of time, in the forwarding of mail through these tubes would not warrant the continued expenditure for that end, and therefore the committee has not recommended the appropriation.

In addition to that, other cities are demanding that this pneumatic-tube service be extended to them and that they should have the same facilities which have been extended to the cities I have named. The proposition was offered in the bill by the committee this year to provide for the extension of the tube service to the cities of Chicago and St. Louis. The committee also had been called upon to investigate the question of extending the tube service to other large cities of the country, and that committee make a report as to the probable expense of maintaining this tube service in other cities as well as those named.

Mr. Chairman, the committee was satisfied that the greatest expedition that could be obtained by the use of any of these pneumatic tubes in the cities where they are now introduced would not exceed from thirty to forty minutes, and for this service the Government was paying an exorbitant rate of rental for the use of the tubes. I presume that gentlemen here on the floor of the House, representing the cities where the tube service now exists, will make a determined effort to put that item back into the bill. But it is merely a fad. It is a very nice thing to have a letter put into the New York post-office and by compressed air be shot almost instantly to Brooklyn or to the great central railroad stations for transportation elsewhere. After all it is merely fad. It does not pay for the money we expend upon it. The results do not justify the expenditure, and, therefore, when this appeal is made by these gentlemen, I feel that it is very properly chargeable to local pride for the maintenance of this expedited service in those cities where it is already established without reference to the benefits to be derived by the country at large by the use of the pneumatic service.

Mr. Chairman, upon the second item I wish to be heard but briefly. That is the question of railway mail pay. In that connection I wish to say that it would be a piece of almost impertinence on my part to attempt to add anything to what has been already so ably stated by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY], a member of the commission. I have read as carefully as might be the testimony taken before the commission, and I have reached the same conclusion that the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] have reached upon this point—that is to say, that this question ought to be considered by a commission and a report made to this House, and let action be taken after that has been received.

I would like to see this done upon an entirely different line from what the railway mail pay has heretofore proceeded upon, and that, instead of its being a compensation fixed almost entirely by weight, the mail pay ought to be fixed largely, if not entirely, upon the space devoted to carrying the mail, coupled with speed. Speed and space are the two elements that should be considered in fixing the rate. A railroad company, for instance, might give us all the space we needed, or more than we could occupy, but if its cars were not run at a good rate of speed, or if, on the other hand, they were run at an uncommonly low rate of speed, it would be of no practical value to us in the transportation of the mails.

Or, on the other hand, the company might give us a rapid train, but if we had not the proper space and proper facilities for handling the mail, it would answer no satisfactory purpose to the Government; but a combination of space and speed with the element, of course, of weight considered—at least to the extent of fixing a minimum weight which should go on a car—that would be a proper basis, I think, for fixing the railway mail pay. And upon that line the gentleman from Massachusetts has well said that action should be taken, and that in view of the experts who have been heard upon the question that would seem to be a proper basis on which to fix the terms of payment for this railway mail service.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman allow me—

Mr. BROMWELL. In a moment. I should be willing that this matter might go on at the present rate until that was demonstrated by such a commission, or even, if necessary, that the railway mail pay should be carried on upon the same basis that contracts are now made—that is, for a period of four years—with the understanding that at the end of that time proper remedies should be applied.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GAINES. The gentleman has said that "space and speed" are the elements to consider in making up the mail pay. Now, I would ask the gentleman why he takes into consideration the question of speed, when on the passenger trains of the country passenger rates are no higher on the fast trains than they are on the accommodation or slow trains?

Mr. BROMWELL. I will answer the gentleman as best I can. In the first place, I do not think his premises are correct.

Mr. GAINES. Why, it is precisely the same thing. If you go 50 miles on a railroad, whether you go on a fast train or a slow one, you pay the same rate.

Mr. BROMWELL. But the gentleman must admit, of course, that it costs a great deal more to run a train a mile a minute than to run a train 30 miles an hour.

Mr. GAINES. Undoubtedly. But the gentleman knows and I know that there is a fast train running from here to Cincinnati on the Louisville and Nashville road. Now, the fare on that train is precisely the same when I go through there to Nashville as it is on the slow train.

Mr. BROMWELL. But the question of cost to the railroad company necessarily enters into the question.

Mr. THROPP. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee whether in the case he cites the railroad company is making as much as it formerly did?

Mr. GAINES. I do not know as to that. They are making the same charge for everybody. All must pay this same rate.

Mr. BROMWELL. Well, I think it is understood, and the gentleman from Tennessee understands it as well as anybody, that the faster you run a train the more expensive it is to the railroad company.

Mr. GAINES. Then why should they not charge more for carrying passengers on fast trains?

Mr. BROMWELL. Take, for instance, the Burlington train going out of Chicago. There was an interview published with the fireman of that train in a paper, in which the statement was made that a ton of coal is burned every twenty minutes on that train.

Mr. GAINES. But the rate from Chicago to Nashville is cheaper than it ever was before.

Mr. BROMWELL. That may be true, because other economies permit it.

Mr. GAINES. Then why should not the same thing apply to the carrying of the mails?

Mr. BROMWELL. I say the three elements that ought to be considered in fixing railway mail pay here should be space, which is of most importance; second, the rate of speed, which is one of the elements that the Post-Office Department must necessarily compel the railroad companies to give; and, third, a minimum rate of weight; so that while the railroad company is giving ample space it shall not give more space than is needed and, in other words, compel the Government, by giving space and speed, to give them a greater rate of railway mail pay than under the one based upon weight alone.

Now, as I suggested, I have nothing to add to what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] has said upon this. He has given it an exhaustive study, and probably no man in this House, unless it be the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD], is so well prepared to reach conclusions on this subject, and so I leave it at that, and pass to the third of these items which are set aside.

Mr. Chairman, if the members of this House will take the reports of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General for the last seven or eight years past, they will find a uniform statement year after year in regard to the special facilities for fast mail. In this year's report, on page 16, they will find the following language, and it is exactly the same in the reports of previous years:

[Second Assistant's report, page 16, "special facilities."]

In submitting the estimates for several years past this office has declined to include the item of "special facilities" for reasons heretofore stated, but notwithstanding appropriations have been made.

The annual rate of expenditure for the service on June 30, 1900, was \$195,722.50, and this sum was expended as shown in the following statement:

No. of route.	Termini.	Railroad company.	Miles.	Pay per annum.
109004	New York, N. Y., to Philadelphia, Pa.	Pennsylvania	90.65	\$11,331.25
113001	Philadelphia, Pa., to Washington, D. C.	Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore	137.43	17,178.75
114002	Washington, D. C., to Danville Junction, Va.	Southern	238.20	29,775.00
118013	Danville Junction, Va., to Atlanta, Ga.	do	409.40	51,175.00
121003	Atlanta to Westpoint, Ga.	Atlanta and Westpoint	86.20	10,705.00
124001	Westpoint, Ga., to Montgomery, Ala.	Western Railway of Alabama	85.63	10,703.75
124012	Montgomery, Ala., to New Orleans, La.	Louisville and Nashville	318.27	39,783.75
155010	Kansas City to Newton, Kans.	Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe	201.2	25,000.00
Total				195,722.50

All of the items in this table, except the last one, are a subsidy given to a system of roads commencing at New York City and running to New Orleans, the last item being a subsidy to the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe line from Kansas City to Newton, Kans., about 201 miles. The Assistant Postmaster-General then adds:

The appropriation for the current fiscal year is \$196,238.75. No estimate is submitted for the next fiscal year.

That has been, year after year, the report of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General. He has refused to make any recommendation for this special fast mail subsidy; and yet year after year the subsidy is made, and the subsidy is paid to these roads. In the hearing before the Postal Commission the question was asked by Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts, of Mr. Shallenberger, the Second Assistant Postmaster-General—

Is not the matter discretionary with the Department even after Congress makes the appropriation?

And Mr. Shallenberger answered:

Well, the Department would have the power to withhold it; but having recommended to Congress the advisability of withholding it, the Department is bound to assume that Congress desires the appropriation to be used, so long as it is made.

I want to say that every member of the postal commission with the exception of three, Mr. CHANDLER not joining in the report, with the exception of Senator MARTIN and Mr. CATCHINGS, reported adversely to the continuance of this subsidy. And even Mr. CATCHINGS, of the House, and Senator MARTIN, of Virginia, have stated no reasons in their report further than the one I have just called attention to, that it was discretionary with the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, and therefore, as he exercised the discretion, it must imply that he thought it ought to be made. This is what Mr. CATCHINGS says in his report:

I concur in the foregoing report of Mr. MOODY, with the exception of so much thereof as might be held to refer to "special facilities appropriations." These appropriations have not been made mandatory, but subject to the discretion of the Postmaster-General. No doubt he would discontinue the expenditure if the service now enjoyed by the communities in question could be secured without it. I can not unite in the recommendation that these appropriations be discontinued.

T. C. CATCHINGS.

Now, Senator MARTIN, who also filed a minority report on that subject, used almost identically, and I do not know but what it is identically the same language, giving only the one reason, that in the language of the bill the expenditure was entirely optional with the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, and as he exercised the option and expended the money, therefore the appropriation ought to be continued. Now, we have answered that by the reply of General Shallenberger made to the commission:

"That although the language of this appropriation might be directory and not mandatory," yet for years and years the Second Assistant Postmaster-General comes in with his report to this House and says that he will not recommend, for the reasons given in the past, the continuation of this appropriation, and for years and years the effort is made on the floor of this House to have that stricken out of the bill, and the House votes it in, how can the Postmaster-General act otherwise than he does, which is to yield to his own good judgment and discretion to what he might well consider an order of Congress upon the subject.

Now, in the report of another member of this commission [Mr. FLEMING] on page 30, is given a valuable résumé of the history of this subject of fast mail appropriations. I will ask the Clerk to read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

The first act granting the facilities, or subsidies, was approved March 3, 1877. This act appropriated \$150,000, but I have not been able to ascertain on what routes the money was expended.

The act of June 17, 1877, appropriated \$125,000. The act of March 3, 1879, appropriated \$150,000. The act of June 11, 1880, appropriated \$350,000. The act of March 1, 1881, appropriated \$425,000. Of this latter sum the Department saw fit to expend only \$374,530.64. This expenditure was distributed over 26 different postal routes and divided up among 14 different lines of railway running in various directions from New York City north to Springfield and Buffalo; west to Philadelphia, Chicago, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, and St. Louis, and south to Washington, Richmond, Charleston, Savannah, St. Augustine, Charlotte, Atlanta, New Orleans, and so on.

By the act of May 4, 1882, Congress appropriated \$500,000 for special facilities. Out of this sum the Department found it necessary to expend only \$185,121.32. This expenditure embraced only 11 postal routes and was distributed among only 9 railroads. With some minor changes, this condition existed until June 30, 1893. From July 1, 1893, to June 30, 1897, the expenditures for special facilities amounted to \$171,238.75 per annum, the number of routes embraced in these expenditures being only 9 and the railroads among which the amount was distributed being only 6, and these routes and railroads being all included in the single general mail line from New York to New Orleans. The act of 1897, in addition to the line from New York to New Orleans, embraced service between Kansas City, Mo., and Newton, Kans., a distance of 201.02 miles, for which an additional sum of \$25,000 was appropriated, and the total appropriation for 1897 was \$195,722.50. This latter sum has been continued up to the present time.

It will thus be seen that the number of mail routes enjoying this subsidy was reduced from 26 in 1882 down to 9 in 1893, with the addition of 2 more routes in 1897 between Kansas City and Newton. The number of railroads drawing this extra pay has been reduced from 14 in 1882 down to 6 in 1893, and this number was increased by 1 additional road in 1897.

It is difficult to justify the expenditure of this money over this one particular route between New York and New Orleans, to say nothing of the little 200-mile route from Kansas City to Newton, when no such extra pay is being given to any other route, not even to those roads whose trains run across the sparsely settled country and over the mountains between the Mississippi Valley and the Pacific Ocean.

It should furthermore be stated that the Post-Office Department long ago recommended to Congress the advisability of withholding the special appropriation. Postmaster-General Wanamaker, in his report under date of November 30, 1891, declined to include in his budget for the following year any estimate for special facilities, the reason given being that such appropriations were not necessary and created dissatisfaction on the part of other roads not receiving the benefits. In a letter addressed to the chairman of the House Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, under date of February 25, 1892, Postmaster-General Wanamaker further stated "the continuance of the special-facility allowance has for some years past been a source of much annoyance to the Department, and has hampered the best interests of the mail service, because railroads operating in contiguous territory, and to some extent paralleling the roads which receive the extra pay, object to rendering equally good or quicker schedule mail service except they be paid corresponding rates."

Since that time no Postmaster-General has asked Congress for an appropriation for special mail facilities. But Congress has forced the appropriation upon the Department in spite of its own protest. It is true the act now provides that the Postmaster-General shall not expend the money unless he deems the expenditure necessary to promote the interests of the postal service, but inasmuch as the act also specifies the particular lines of road to receive the money, and inasmuch as the Department has recommended Congress to withhold the appropriation and Congress insists upon making it, it is not strange that the Department should conclude that Congress desires the appropriation to be expended as long as it is made. There are no doubt

many other routes in the country whose general conditions and surroundings would give them an equal justification for extra pay.
I can see no sufficient reason for continuing the discrimination nor for making the unnecessary expenditure.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, there need be nothing inconsistent in the position of members of this House reversing the vote which they took upon this subject a year ago. At that time the report of the Postal Commission had not been completed; it was not in the hands of the members of this House; and therefore the reasons which ought to appeal now to the judgment and the intelligence of the members of this House perhaps did not exist in as forcible a manner as they do now. I want to call attention of the House to this. I suppose you all have copies of these hearings. In the hearing, commencing on page 447 and running through successive pages of the report, is the examination of General Shallenberger by the Postal Commission. In the course of that examination he submits a report from Mr. Grant, which is particularly strong in showing that neither one of these two subsidies are accomplishing for the Government any of the good results in the way of expedition of the mails claimed for them. Now, I shall read just hurriedly here a few extracts.

Mr. LOUD said in his question to the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, referring to the subsidy on the line from Kansas City to Newton, Kans.:

Do you believe that the Government receives greater returns from the expenditure of the money upon this road than it would receive had it been devoted to any other road in the United States?

A. I do not believe that it receives any greater return from expenditures on this road than it would on any other in the country.

Mr. LOUD. Do you believe that it receives as great advantages as it would have received from some others?

A. I am not prepared at this moment positively to say so, but my impression is that there are roads in the country over which greater returns would be received.

Mr. LOUD. A great amount of mail could have been expedited, and the mail expedited to a greater extent than it has been on this road?

A. Yes.

On page 448 of these hearings—volume 1 it is that I am quoting from—the statement was filed by Mr. Shallenberger with the commission, made by Mr. Alexander Grant, Acting General Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service at the time. Without going through all of that statement, I will read some extracts. I hope the House will read it all. It says:

There seems to be no justification for the special facilities payments, judging from results obtained. If we treated all lines on this basis, then we should pay the Northwestern Railroad for running an early morning train from Chicago (at 2.45 a. m.) to Fort Howard, Wis.; also for Cedar Rapids from Chicago. We should also pay the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railroad for a train leaving Chicago at the same hour, and running to Marion and the West; also the same road for a train from Chicago to Milwaukee and St. Paul; the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy for a train leaving Chicago at 3 a. m. and running to Burlington and Omaha; the Monon Route for a train leaving Chicago in the early morning for Cincinnati.

Mr. GAINES. Will my friend read what is said there about the Louisville and Nashville, an unsubsidized railroad? He substantially says that it is not necessary.

Mr. BROMWELL. Well, I do not know just what the gentleman refers to; but here is one paragraph about the Louisville and Nashville, and possibly that is what the gentleman refers to:

As an evidence that special-facilities money is not necessary to enable railroads in the South to operate fast trains, I would cite the fact that the Louisville and Nashville Railroad maintains two through trains daily between Cincinnati and New Orleans, in addition to trains for local service. These through trains make a speed of 33 and 28 miles an hour, respectively, including stops.

Mr. GAINES. That is what I have in mind.

Mr. BROMWELL. I will ask to insert the entire statement in the RECORD. He makes a similar statement with reference to the special-facilities subsidy to the train running out of Kansas City, on page 458 of the report, and to the same effect.

I presume that, just as last year, gentlemen in favor of this subsidy, possibly the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], who made the statement last year, will read to this House a letter from General Shallenberger, which he will ask the House to construe as favoring this subsidy.

I want to call the attention of the House in advance to the fact that that letter was written on the 3d of March, 1898. You will find it in the RECORD of last year, while the hearing of General Shallenberger before the commission was nine months afterwards, or on the 1st of December, I think it was, 1898. So that if we are to place any reliance at all on the statement of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General we ought to construe it as we construe a man's will—by his last utterance, when he had more wisdom and experience than at first. I merely call attention to the two dates, and if credence is to be given where the two statements seem to conflict it ought to be given to the later utterance rather than the earlier.

Mr. GAINES. If the gentleman will pardon me, I would like to ask him if General Shallenberger had before him the Grant data when he wrote the letter?

Mr. BROMWELL. I am not advised as to that; I presume he did. At any rate, the two Grant letters received the indorsement of General Shallenberger, who says, in reply to questions, that he

himself is not so well informed as Mr. Grant, and therefore he substitutes Mr. Grant's statement and indorses it as correct.

Now, the gentleman will also stand up and plead eloquently for the subsidy on the ground that the South needs it, that it is a sparsely settled country, that it needs the special-facility trains from New York to the Southwest. The original history of this subsidy has been repeated in this House many times. It was originally a subsidy started in Massachusetts, going down by the way of New York City, through Philadelphia and Washington, and down the coast to Tampa, for the purpose of expediting the mails to Cuba and the West Indies. In 1893 that was switched from a fast mail to Cuba into a fast mail to New Orleans, and the subsidy has been given to these various lines since that time, with the exception that \$25,000 was taken off from a part between Worcester or Springfield, Mass., and New York, which was discontinued.

Mr. GAINES. If the gentleman will allow me a suggestion, I asked him about the Grant letter. I find General Shallenberger indorses it and says in this report, page 451:

I would say that this paper, having been prepared by Mr. Grant from official data, is, of course, official, authoritative, and would be preferred to any statement I can make from memory.

Mr. BROMWELL. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for the suggestion. Now, the gentleman from Virginia will say to us, as he has said in the past, that without this appropriation this system of fast mail train will be abolished. He will state the fact that before 1893 there were trains running between New York and New Orleans that did not make as good time as this fast mail does to-day. I want to call the attention of gentlemen of the House to the very letter he will produce from General Shallenberger—if he produces it at all, and if he does not you will find it printed in the RECORD of last year—giving the time-tables of the trains in 1893 between New York, Tampa, and New Orleans, and the time-tables of the subsidized trains now in existence on that road.

I have taken the trouble to compare the time made by the unsubsidized trains of this system in 1893 with the subsidized trains of 1899 and 1900. The unsubsidized train of 1893 is the one that was No. 35 over this same line of route from New York by the way of the Pennsylvania road practically to Washington, over the Southern road and the Louisville and Nashville; that was train 35 unsubsidized, and in that letter he gives the running time of that train to the different points along this line. I will print this table in the RECORD, but I want to call the attention of the House to it as showing that the alleged difference in favor of the subsidized train is not borne out.

Now, to compare that with train 35—the same number—which left at a different hour, which is the subsidized train south.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman will pardon me, my recollection is that train 35 was put on a short time before the subsidy was granted, at the request of the Postmaster-General, for the purpose of making an experiment.

Mr. BROMWELL. This train 35 did not run at the same hour as the present train, and I am informed by the gentleman from California that the train had been in existence some time previously.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I think it had not.

The table referred to by Mr. BROMWELL is as follows:

New York to—	1893, No. 35, unsubsidized.		1898, No. 35, subsidized.		Difference.
	<i>h.</i>	<i>m.</i>	<i>h.</i>	<i>m.</i>	
Washington	6	13	6	45	+0 32
Danville	13	0	13	25	+0 25
Greensboro	14	25	15	02	+0 37
Charlotte	16	55	17	30	+0 35
Atlanta	24	25	23	40	-0 45
Montgomery	28	20	28	20
Mobile	34	45	35	15	+0 30
New Orleans	39	05	39	40	+0 35
Houston	55	37	52	25	-3 12
San Antonio	63	30	59	55	-3 35

Mr. BROMWELL. Train 35, unsubsidized, from New York to Washington, was six hours and thirteen minutes; subsidized, six hours and forty-five minutes, or thirty-two minutes longer in reaching Washington than the unsubsidized train. New York to Danville, unsubsidized, thirteen hours; subsidized, thirteen hours and twenty-five minutes, or twenty-five minutes longer. From New York to Greensboro fourteen hours and twenty-five minutes unsubsidized, and fifteen hours and two minutes subsidized, or thirty-seven minutes longer.

Without going into the whole of this table I will give you the results: From New York to Washington the subsidized takes thirty-two minutes longer than the unsubsidized; to Danville, twenty-five minutes longer; to Greensboro, thirty-seven minutes longer; to Charlotte, thirty-five minutes longer; to Montgomery, the same time; to Atlanta, forty-five minutes shorter; to Mobile, thirty minutes longer; to New Orleans, thirty-five minutes longer.

Now, west of New Orleans, when Texas points are reached, there is an actual saving of time, probably due to the connections that it makes. It gets to Houston in three hours and twelve minutes less time; to San Antonio in three hours and thirty-five minutes less. But if we are going to give this subsidy it ought to be given to the Texas road, which is not in this system at all, as that is the line that makes the connection with this fast mail, so called.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. The Texas roads do not want any subsidy.

Mr. BROMWELL. I do not suppose they do. I do not know of any other roads in the country that do.

Mr. SIMS. As I understand the gentleman, the unsubsidized roads carried the mail just as well as is done under this subsidy?

Mr. BROMWELL. They carried the mails just as well for the regular pay, without any subsidy.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman allow me to read a few lines from the report of this railroad mail commission, report 1? I read from the testimony of General Shallenberger, on page 454 of volume 1:

Q. Do you mean to say that prior to the subsidy system these trains over the Southern road outstripped the trains over all other roads to such an extent as to secure from them the freight and passenger business?

A. No; I think these trains have been developed since the period when the subsidy became available.

Mr. LOUD. Which is the subsidized train?

Mr. CATCHINGS. I do not think it matters; I am willing for you to put in any other you please.

Mr. LOUD. I make the statement that the trains made the same time before the subsidy was granted that they do now.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I will ask you that question, Did the unsubsidized trains make as fast time before the subsidy was granted to the Southern road as they do now?

Mr. LOUD. I assert that they made the same time in December, 1892, that they make to-day.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Well, I am asking for information.

Mr. LOUD. And by reason of that fact they secured the passenger traffic; and they made that time to make connection with the Southern Pacific which goes to the West, leaving two hours after this train arrives in the morning at New Orleans.

Here, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] is asking for "information" of the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] and got this reply, and yet he favors this subsidy.

Mr. BROMWELL. Now, I want to call attention to another

point. To hear this annual controversy upon the special fast-mail subsidy one would imagine that this subsidy was all the compensation that these roads obtained for carrying the mail; that the whole question was whether they were to get anything at all for carrying the mail over this route. As a matter of fact, these roads are liberally paid for carrying the mails, without reference to this subsidy. I have here a table which I will insert in the RECORD. I will refer only to an item or two, to show what these railroads get in addition to the subsidy. The aggregate runs up to \$1,720,446.97.

The Pennsylvania line, on this part of its line—not the whole Pennsylvania system, but the part running from New York down to Philadelphia—gets \$394,651; from Philadelphia to Baltimore, \$307,837. Then the Southern road comes in with its two branches, on the first of which it gets \$318,506, and on the second \$404,230, making nearly \$723,000. The Atlanta and West Point road gets \$55,000, the Western Railroad of Alabama over \$53,000, the Louisville and Nashville \$186,000.

The compensation received by these roads make altogether more than a million and a quarter of dollars, including, of course, this subsidy.

Mr. GAINES. Including how many roads?

Mr. BROMWELL. Some six roads altogether—the Pennsylvania; the Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore, which is practically the Pennsylvania; the Southern; the Atlanta and West Point; the Western Railroad of Alabama, and the Louisville and Nashville.

Now, let me call attention to another fact. The whole State of New York, with all its railroad system, including every railroad in the State through which the railway mail pay is distributed, has a mileage six times as great as this continuous line from New York to New Orleans; yet those railroads in the State of New York get only one and one-half times as much mail pay. In other words, taking the proportion of mileage on these two systems, the roads on this subsidized line get four times as much on the average as the New York lines.

The railroads in the State of Pennsylvania, aggregating five times the length of this system, get \$30,000 less a year of mail pay. The roads in the State of Illinois, with nearly eight times as much mileage on which the mails are carried, get only one and one-fourth times as much pay as is given to this system.

No. of route.	Distance.	Ordinary annual pay for transportation.	Payment for postal cars.	Subsidy.	Total.	Name of railroad.
	Miles.					
109004	90.65	\$310,255.97	\$73,064.75	\$11,331.25	\$394,651.97	Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore).
113001	137.43	252,865.70	37,793.25	17,173.75	307,837.70	Southern.
114002	238.20	231,563.74	57,168.00	29,775.00	318,506.74	Do.
118013	409.40	291,230.78	61,825.00	51,175.00	404,230.78	Atlanta and Westpoint.
121003	86.29	35,990.29	8,620.00	10,775.00	55,385.29	Western Railway of Alabama.
124001	85.72	34,446.53	8,563.00	10,703.75	53,713.33	Louisville and Nashville.
124012	318.27	114,570.41	31,827.00	39,783.75	186,181.16	
Total.....					1,720,446.97	

Total length of subsidized lines.....	miles.....	1,365.78
Average subsidy per mile.....		\$125.00
Total compensation.....		\$1,720,446.97
Average compensation per mile, about.....		\$1,260.00

New York, with a mileage six times as great, gets only one and one-half times as much pay.

Pennsylvania, with a mileage over five times as great, gets \$30,000 less per year.

Illinois, with a mileage nearly eight times as great, gets only one and one-fourth times as much.

But gentlemen say we need to give the subsidy in order to expedite the mails and get rapid service. I have alluded to the fact that the service before this subsidy was granted was fully as good as now and that, in fact, the unsubsidized train went at a more rapid rate than the subsidized train does to-day. Now, let us compare the speed on this subsidized train with the speed on some of the other great railroads of the country.

This 3.35 subsidized train from Washington to Charlotte, 380 miles, makes an average rate of speed of 36 miles an hour. Why, sir, the Chesapeake and Ohio or the Baltimore and Ohio, crossing the mountains, plowing their way through tunnels, with curves and heavy grades—with which there is nothing to compare on the line of the Southern road—makes between Cincinnati and Washington a rate of speed fully equal to that.

From Washington to Atlanta the average is only 34.7 miles an hour. That is not rapid railroad traveling. From Washington to New Orleans, a distance of something less than 1,360 miles, the average rate of speed is only 35 miles an hour. Compare this with the speed on some of the other great railroads of the country. The Illinois Central, on train No. 3, from Chicago to Cairo, 365 miles, makes a speed of 37.4 miles an hour. The same road from Chicago to Memphis, 527 miles, makes an average of 34.2 miles an hour. The same road between Chicago and New Orleans, 923

miles, makes an average of 35 miles an hour. The Santa Fe road from Chicago to Kansas City, train No. 17, makes for 458 miles an average rate of 40 miles an hour.

On the Burlington road, from Chicago to Kansas City, a distance of 500 miles, the average rate is 36 miles per hour. On the Baltimore and Ohio road, the S. and W., from Parkersburg to St. Louis, a distance of 577 miles, the average speed is 34 miles an hour. The Big Four Railroad, from Cleveland to St. Louis, a distance of 548 miles, makes an average of 36 miles an hour, and I am told that the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy for the first 83 miles out from Chicago runs nearly a mile a minute, or makes the 83 miles in eighty-five minutes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, taking the Empire Express on the New York Central, or any of the great trunk lines or systems that carry the mails, you will find that 35 or 40 miles an hour is not considered an excessive rate of speed, and yet special Southern trains that get this subsidy, in addition to the regular pay—because they receive that also—make the rate much less than the average of any of these other roads. Where, then, is the justification for the subsidy?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman please explain why this road to which he refers makes only 35 miles an hour, while other roads make 40 and 45?

Mr. BROMWELL. There may be merely physical reasons—
Mr. LIVINGSTON. I hope the gentleman will explain the reasons, if any exist.

Mr. BROMWELL. I was going on to say that there may be physical reasons in some cases. But I do not believe that there is any physical reason here, on any part of the line of this subsidized road, that would not be true in a greater degree, as far as the difficulty of making this speed is concerned, on any other road crossing the mountains from the East to the West, either the Appalachian system or the Rocky Mountains.

Take, for instance, the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. This road runs across bridges, through tunnels, over viaducts, and has heavy grades, while the subsidized road, excepting a small part of it in the State of Virginia, is comparatively an easy grade. The grades on the Baltimore and Ohio are in some cases very heavy.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. How about that part of the road east of us?

Mr. BROMWELL. Take, for instance, the road from New York to Washington. There are no heavy grades there. Why give a subsidy on that part of the line? The gentleman does not answer. He is not interested in that part of it.

Mr. SIMS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio what is the difference in time between the subsidized trains and the other trains running over this same road which are not subsidized? What increase of speed has been made by the subsidized train, and what expedition does this train get by reason of the subsidy?

Mr. BROMWELL. The Postmaster-General, in answer to that inquiry, said—and I have no doubt that this matter will be discussed fully by gentlemen who favor the subsidy—that it was really a detriment to the Post-Office Department that this subsidy should be continued. He said that if it were taken from this road he could get a portion of the mail which now goes over it carried on other roads; or, in other words, that he could secure competitive bidding.

Mr. GAINES. So as to let these other lines bid for the mail?

Mr. BROMWELL. Yes; but the other roads can not come in because of this subsidy. They are placed at a disadvantage.

Mr. SIMS. Has this subsidy had any effect—that is the point I want to get at—upon the running of trains? In other words, are there other trains on the road as fast or faster than this train to which the subsidy goes?

Mr. BROMWELL. If the gentleman will permit me, I will state that I made an exhaustive research last year on that subject, which is embodied in the report and embodied in the RECORD; and if gentlemen choose to look into it, they will find complete statements as to the trains run by this road in comparison to this subsidized train. Instead of the subsidized train being the fastest, they will find that there are a number of other trains that make better time.

Mr. SIMS. That is just the point I wanted to find out.

Mr. BROMWELL. And so far as the subsidy has tended to expedite the trains, it seems to have had just the opposite effect.

Mr. SIMS. Have they so changed the schedule as to make it extra expensive to run this train?

Mr. BROMWELL. I do not so understand it. I do understand from the statement of the Assistant Postmaster-General that they would have to run this train, whether they got the subsidy or not, by reason of their passenger, freight, and express business.

Now, I know that the Postmaster-General will be quoted, and his assistant will be quoted, in reference to this matter by gentlemen favoring the subsidy. We will be told that there is a faster service than there was in 1893. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is very natural. Of course there is. And so also with reference to every other road in the country since then. All of these roads have been changing their equipments, their motive power, have put down heavier rails and generally improved their train service so that a rate that would have made our hair stand on end ten years ago—say the rate of 35 miles an hour—would be insignificant in comparison to these trains which travel from 50 to 60 miles an hour.

Why? Not because it gets a subsidy to help it make speed, but because of the improvements in the road itself. Ten years ago a large part of this line—that is, the Southern road—was in the hands of a receiver. It was a bankrupt road; but it has since been well managed. It was taken out of the hands of the receiver, its roadbed was improved, its grades were probably cut down, possibly some of the curves were taken out, heavier rails were put on, better motive power, better cars, better men to handle the trains, and the result is that they do have an improved service over what it was ten years ago, but not due to any subsidy.

Mr. GAINES. They have the air-brake appliances now.

Mr. BROMWELL. And air brakes, of course, that save many an hour on a long journey in the stoppage and starting of trains.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I may want to answer some of the re-

marks made on the other side of this question, and therefore reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMS. I should like to ask the gentleman one question and that is this: Have these different railroads sent representatives before the committee to ask this, or how does it come that it is put into the bill? Do the railroad companies themselves ask for it, or how does it get into the bill?

Mr. BROMWELL. So far as I know of my personal knowledge, no representative of a railroad has ever appeared before our Post-Office Committee, but the committee recognize that year after year, although after an effort we have had it thrown out of the bill once or twice, yet when it comes into the House it finds advocates and earnest defenders here on the floor in many gentlemen who represent the districts and States through which this system runs, and who feel it incumbent upon them to support this appropriation, as though it was a benefit to the people of their districts, while as a matter of fact it is a benefit to nobody except this line of railroad.

Mr. GAINES. The House threw it out in the Fifty-fifth Congress and the Senate put it back.

Mr. BROMWELL. Yes.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I will say in response to the gentleman from Tennessee that so far as the subsidy from Kansas City to Newton is concerned the railroad protests against it and does not wish it.

Mr. SIMS. I was referring to the other.

Mr. COWHERD. I am glad the gentleman from Massachusetts has made that statement, because I have stated it before the House heretofore, and it has been denied and laughed at.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Before our commission they stated that they did not desire it. It is a subsidy to the Kansas City newspapers.

Mr. BROMWELL. Then I suppose the gentleman from Kansas City [Mr. COWHERD] will join in asking that this subsidy be dispensed with?

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I never represented a railroad company in asking for that subsidy. I always represented the people who were served, and when I have stated heretofore on the floor of this House that the railroad company do not want the subsidy, and protest against performing the service even with the subsidy, gentlemen have laughed at my statement as ridiculous. I am glad that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Moody] has borne me out in that statement.

Mr. SIMS. The demand does not seem to come from the railroad companies, then, so far as this Southern subsidy is concerned.

Mr. BROMWELL. I know nothing about that at all.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will permit me, I do know something about that. The Southern Railroad did submit to the postal commission a very long communication in support of this special-facility appropriation.

Mr. BROMWELL. I will say that on page 656, Volume I, of the hearings before the postal commission you will find the testimony given by the president of the Southern Railway Company on this subject. I think he is the only railway official who was examined on the subject.

Mr. GAINES. If the gentleman will allow me, I should like to ask one other question. Have any "people"—a great multitude, a half a dozen, or even one—come before the Post-Office Committee asking for this subsidy?

Mr. BROMWELL. We have never had anybody appear before the committee to advocate it.

Mr. GAINES. Then it is in here and nobody wants it—neither the "people" nor railroads.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want the gentleman to answer a question, for the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] seems to be remarkably ignorant about who wants this subsidy. I want to ask the gentleman from Cincinnati [Mr. BROMWELL] if he is not aware of the fact that the municipal authorities of Nashville and of Chattanooga and of Knoxville and of Columbus—

Mr. GAINES. And the legislature of Tennessee.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And the legislature of Tennessee and the city of New Orleans and the city of Atlanta and the city of Charleston and the city of Savannah and the city of Mobile have all asked for this?

Mr. GAINES. And they have not one of them had the facts before them, I dare say, on which to form an opinion, which we have before us here for the first time.

Mr. BROMWELL. I will answer the question of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON]. As a man who has lived to the age that he has, he must know that you can get any resolution, indorsing any project on earth, passed by any body of men if you have got the right kind of men to take hold of it and present it; and I venture to say that you can get the members of this House to sign, without ever looking at it, a petition to hang the gentleman [laughter], and I mean no disrespect at all to the gentleman. I might have substituted myself. When the gentleman says that

the legislature of Tennessee and the city councils of these various other cities and boards of trade, etc., have indorsed these things, that is common experience.

We can get any proposition on earth indorsed by any chamber of commerce or city council or legislature, if we go at it in the right way; and, as the gentleman from Tennessee has said, with all due respect to the gentleman and with all due respect to the other gentlemen who represent the State of Tennessee here, who are as competent as any men on earth, and with all due respect to the gentlemen who form the boards of trade and the city councils of these various cities, I venture to say that they do not know as much as the snap of your finger about the whole subject, and, therefore, somebody interested in this particular matter was able to get their unanimous indorsement probably; and the more unanimous it was the less they knew about the whole subject. I understand the gentleman from Tennessee wants to add something.

Mr. GAINES. I want to say in reference to these resolutions from Knoxville, Tenn., and the legislature of Tennessee, that they do not show or state the facts upon which they are based, and I do not believe they had the facts before them when they were passed, for we know that for the first time all the facts are brought out in this House to-day, and not until to-day.

They have never been fully developed in this House or Senate. We have all the proof here to-day. The hearings were not accessible or published, or both, last session, and the report on this bill was not filed until a few days ago. Had these hearings and this report been before them, I do not believe these resolutions would have been passed. We have struggled to get to the facts and truth of the situation set out in this voluminous report, and have done so to-day. You see and hear the facts are new, and old errors pointed out we must here correct.

And, sirs, while this subsidy is in part to railroads that run through my State, with these facts only in part before me, on former occasions I have uniformly voted against it, and I believe the people of my State and the legislature of my State, which is an intelligent and honorable body, if they had the same facts before them as we have before us would do the same thing; and in saying that I think that I respect and reflect their will and wisdom.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman answer a question? Do you know what facts the legislature had before them?

Mr. GAINES. I do not think the Tennessee legislature had any special knowledge on the subject.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do not want to know what you think; do you know what facts they had?

Mr. GAINES. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen will be in order.

Mr. GAINES. I know they did not have the books that have been opened here for the first time to-day, nor the private information I have, showing this subsidy is not needed, given me by General Shallenberger.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. You do not know.

Mr. GAINES. I know they did not have it, on general principles—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is not what you know on general principles.

Mr. GAINES (continuing). Because they have not been in general circulation, and each member has only one copy.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I request the privilege of extending my remarks in the RECORD, as I have several tables I wish to insert.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman will have leave to extend his remarks.

Mr. BROMWELL. I desire to make the same request.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I desire to make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, these several requests will be granted.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, while I am sure I will not agree with the remarks to be submitted by the gentleman from Mississippi, I take pleasure in yielding him twenty minutes of my time, reserving the remainder.

[Mr. CATCHINGS addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from Tennessee to reserve the remainder of his time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. FLETCHER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CUNNINGHAM, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 2991. An act confirming two locations of Chippewa half-breed scrip in the State (then Territory) of Utah.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment a bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

H. R. 13491. An act authorizing the Mount Carmel Development Company to draw water from Wabash River at Grand Rapids, Wabash County, Ill.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore had, in compliance with the concurrent resolution of the Senate No. 87, appointed as tellers on the part of the Senate to count the electoral votes for President and Vice-President of the United States, in the Hall of the House of Representatives, Wednesday, the 13th day of February, 1901, Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. CAFFEY.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore of the Senate had, in compliance with House concurrent resolution No. 70, appointed Mr. HANNA, Mr. SPOONER, and Mr. JONES of Arkansas as the committee on the part of the Senate to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect on the 4th day of March next.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. CROMER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take up any time of the committee with any remarks at this time. I would like to have the privilege of printing in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CROMER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, some days ago when the postal codification bill was under consideration sundry amendments were offered with a view of remedying some of the evils of the system of unlimited competition in the letting of star-route contracts. None of these amendments was adopted by the committee, not, in my opinion, because a majority of the members voting were not favorable to the objects sought to be accomplished by the amendments, but by reason of a general disposition on the part of the members to uphold the committee in its efforts to prevent the ingrafting of new legislation on a codification measure, the effect of which might be to jeopardize a much-needed codification of the postal laws, and a feeling that the Department, by its order of February 13, 1900, inaugurated a reform in star-route letting and there was no immediate necessity for legislation. The debate, however, served a good purpose in that it brought out some of the evils of unlimited competition in this branch of the public service.

Mr. Chairman, it is not often that a member of this House is constrained or justified in criticising a too parsimonious conduct of the public business; and while I am not well enough informed on the subject to speak with authority, I apprehend there is no other branch of the postal service in the administration of which there need be any criticism of undue parsimony, though there is a vague impression in the minds of many amounting almost to a conviction that in many branches of the service Congress has authorized expenditures which may be characterized as extremely liberal, if not wastefully extravagant. Let us examine for a moment the facts as to the compensation paid for the carrying of the star routes of these United States, aggregating 22,834 in number and extending over 269,857 miles—and I here digress to call attention to the fact that star routes are not matters of purely local interest, but matters of general interest to all of our people and to all sections of the country.

As was well said on the floor of the House a few days ago by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] in answer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], "the postal service must be treated as a whole," and these star routes, while they carry some local mail, carry a vastly greater proportion of mail of the various classes which originate in the commercial and literary centers of the country, as well as outgoing mail directed to these centers of population and business. It is just as important to the business man in Chicago or in New York that his letter, his trade journal, his price list, shall be carried to the villages, farms, and ranches far distant from railways as it is to the dwellers there that their orders for literature and merchandise shall be promptly dispatched; and the Government is just as much under obligations to give a prompt and reasonably frequent mail service to the dwellers in the sparsely settled regions of the country as it is to give a daily service to the dwellers in the more thickly populated portions of the country or a two to four times a day delivery to dwellers in towns and cities.

Twenty-five years ago we paid an average of nearly 10 cents a mile for carrying the star routes of the United States; to-day we are paying an average of a little over 3½ cents a mile for carrying these routes. Then we paid 15 cents a mile for carrying the routes in the Western section of the country; now we pay less than 4½

cents a mile, on an average, in the same section, as is shown by the statement herewith:

Statement showing the cost per mile traveled of star service in the entire country and in the different sections on June 30 of the years given.

Year.	Entire United States.	First section, Eastern.	Second section, Southern.	Third section, middle West.	Fourth section, far West.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
1875.....	9.96	7.16	8.33	7.33	15.09
1880.....	9.62	6	6.65	5.55	14.36
1885.....	6.52	5.56	5.19	6.02	8.14
1890.....	5.46	5.31	4.47	5.44	7.02
1895.....	4.85	5.18	4.07	4.91	5.32
1900.....	3.87	3.79	3.30	3.39	4.45

First section.—States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Second section.—States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Kentucky.

Third section.—States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri.

Fourth section.—States and Territories of Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, Indian and Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, California, and Alaska.

This would certainly be a most gratifying showing of reduction in the cost of Government service if it were not for the fact that this reduction has been at the expense of good service and by beating down the compensation paid for doing this class of the Government's work to a figure which the most tyrannical taskmaster and the most avaricious and soulless oppressor of labor might well envy.

Let us examine for a moment into the question of the reduction of the cost of carrying star routes and determine whether or no the Government is justified in continuing a system which has led to such a tremendous reduction, to the detriment of the service and the oppression of those performing the same. The reduction in the cost of carrying star routes has been constant and continuous since 1875, and during that period of twenty-five years the reduction has been over 65 per cent in the country at large and nearly 75 per cent in the Western section.

During the same period in which this reduction of 65 per cent in the payment of the star-route carriers has taken place, it has been estimated by competent authority that there has been an average increase in the rate of wages paid in the United States of 10 per cent.

The value of horses, large numbers of which are required for the carrying of these star routes, is nearly the same that it was in 1875, and this class of animals are worth 100 per cent more in my section now than they were ten years ago, when the rates for carrying star routes were nearly double what they are to-day. While this reduction of 65 per cent in the cost of the carrying of star routes has been going on (despite the fact that the volume of mail carried has increased) there has been a reduction of only 14½ per cent in the cost of railway-mail pay.

So much for comparisons. Now, let us for a moment consider the amount actually paid to-day for the carrying of star routes. At the average price per mile paid, if the carrier travels 30 miles—and anyone who has any knowledge of the conditions knows that that is a great distance to cover per day each day in the year, rain or shine, heat or snow, over the average country road—if the carrier on horseback, in a gocar, or a four-wheeled vehicle covers this distance every day, he receives from the bountiful hands of this munificent Government the magnificent recompense of \$1.16 per day for his own labor and use of his animals and vehicle, less the blood money which the syndicate bidder exacts from him as his profit in the transaction.

If the carrier travels every day in the year except Sundays, including the Fourth of July and Christmas, he will have accumulated at the end of that period the princely sum of \$363.08, less the profit of the syndicate bidder, providing he has never missed a trip or delayed a mail, and providing that, in spite of the fact that the syndicate bidder may have neglected to pay him for six or eight months, he may have been able, by sponging his meals and horse feed from the people along the route, and standing off the country merchant for the few cheap clothes with which he has attempted to protect himself from the scorching heat of the summer and from the biting blasts of winter, to live up to his contract. If, on the other hand, long-delayed payment by the syndicate has had its intended effect in exhausting the credit and patience of the carrier and compelled him to abandon his route, his appeals to the syndicate for payment for the period during which he carried the mail is met with the statement that he is not entitled to pay because he has violated his contract. Appeals through the Post-Office Department are met by the ever resourceful syndicate bidder with the same plea of violated contract, backed up by a skillfully padded or fraudulently augmented statement of alleged expenses incurred by the syndicate in reletting the contract.

I have listened at various times with a good deal of interest to the efforts that have been made here to increase the pay of men in various branches of the postal service, working generally eight hours a day, protected from the inclemency of the weather, or, if exposed to it, only in so great a degree as one may be who travels the streets and sidewalks of cities and towns; men now receiving from \$800 to \$1,500 per annum, with annual leave with pay and all those other gracious privileges which a kind and indulgent Government has accorded to its public servants who are in a position to appeal en masse to the sympathies of members of Congress; and I have not been lacking in sympathy with some of these movements and efforts, but it seems to me that these advances in pay and emolument and privileges of public servants should be uniform all along the line, and I stand here to make an appeal for the videttes, the skirmishers of this postal army, a body of men with no organization through which they can appeal to Congress. They are the pioneers of the service; they constitute the absolutely indispensable multitudinous extremities of the postal circulation, without which the great heart and arteries would become palsied and paralyzed.

Compared with the hardships which the mail carrier is compelled to undergo, the lives of the other employees of the postal service are those of luxurious ease and comfort. He carries the mails of the people, winter and summer, by day and by night, through torrid heat and drenching rain, biting blasts and blinding snows; floundering through the almost impassable winter mud of Southern country roads or the heaped and drifted snows on Northern lanes; across the burning plains of the Southwest Territories, and through and across the mountain gorges and passes of the Northwest States; swimming the flood-swollen streams in the spring, bearing the heat and burden of the summer sun, drenched by the autumnal downpour and bitten by the blasts of winter as he faces the northers of Texas or snowshoes to mining camps through a Rocky Mountain blizzard. He is the hero of the service, and since its establishment has been the truest type of its indomitable energy in overcoming obstacles. He has been neglected, as the manner of mankind is, as humble and unpretentious heroes generally are, while the honors and the recognition which are rightfully his go to the carpet knight, accessible to the ear of influence and swift to fill it with importunings for special favors.

I doff my hat to the Postmaster-General of the United States and to the Second Assistant of that Department for their appreciation of the necessity for better service on star routes, and for the prompt and practical action taken to secure the same. The order of the 13th of February last will, it is hoped, result in curing the evils to which I have referred. Its effect will be to divorce the Government from the sweat-shop system to which it has been a party, put an end to the licensed confidence game of syndicate star routing, elevate the Government service on star routes to its proper dignity, result in the payment of a fair price for Government service, and give the people of rural districts in fact the service it has attempted to give, but signally failed to do under the old system.

The system of box delivery along star routes which has been inaugurated by the present Postmaster-General is the most important advance and improvement in the postal service which has been inaugurated for years. It carries, as far as practicable, the benefits of rural free delivery to large numbers of people living along star routes, and this with a cost to the Government which is almost infinitesimal. For these enlightened and practical efforts to give a better service to the people of the rural regions of the country the present administration of the Post-Office Department is entitled to great credit, and I rejoice in the tardy recognition which has been given to the star-route carrier—the scout and pioneer and hero of the postal service.

Mr. CROMER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER].

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill making appropriations for service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, contains an appropriation which the report of the committee correctly states is similar to those made for a series of years in former acts, as follows:

For necessary and special facilities on trunk lines from New York and Washington to Atlanta and New Orleans, \$171,338.75: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriation made by this paragraph shall be expended unless the Postmaster-General shall deem such expenditure necessary in order to promote the interest of the postal service.

The amount of this appropriation is not large. It is indeed very small compared with the aggregate of the bill, which carries appropriations largely in excess of \$100,000,000. It affects the business interests of New York and other great commercial cities and centers of the East, to whom it is deeply important to have speedy mail and freight communication with the South and Southwest. It concerns the banker, broker, manufacturer, and the ordinary dealer. To the commercial cities and people of the South living on or near this great trunk line and the branch or lateral

railroads connecting with it and profiting by this speedy mail communication this appropriation possesses the greatest possible value.

They do not share in the comparatively small payment made to carry it out, for hardly any of them, I believe, are stockholders in these railroads, but they do share in the great benefit of speedy mail communication. Hence it is that whenever this appropriation has been assailed or menaced the intelligent commercial bodies of the Southern cities have come to the rescue and urged that this appropriation should not be disturbed. This interest is felt in a marked degree in the city I represent, but I do not believe that the interest of New Orleans in the policy now pursued is any greater than that of Atlanta or other communities lying on the line of route described in the appropriation.

The appropriation proposed follows the language of former appropriation acts, and it is hard to see how it could be more carefully guarded than it is. It is for "special facilities" on "trunk lines"—that is to say, for extra speed and quicker delivery. It is not merely for "special" facilities, but for "necessary" facilities. Nor is it an absolute appropriation, where the money is to be spent, right or wrong. The money is only to be spent if the Postmaster-General is convinced that it is "necessary for the interest of the public service."

I submit that the making of the appropriations from year to year, in spite of the most violent opposition in Congress, amounts to a very strong expression of opinion by the two Houses of Congress that this appropriation is necessary in order to secure "special" facilities for the postal service, and that this opinion of Congress ought to have great weight with the head of the Department. I think, further, that the Postmaster-General, however able and enlightened, might well deem the unanimous judgment of the bankers, merchants, shippers, and other business men of the South in respect to the value and necessity of this service a point well worthy of his consideration. Still, the responsibility is devolved upon the head of the Department of taking final action, and if this payment were an abuse, as has been most absurdly alleged, or were a mere gratuity to one or two trunk railroad lines, he could correct it.

It has happened time and time again in the history of this Government that Congress has made appropriations for this or that object and the Executive has refused to spend the money. I refer especially to river and harbor bills. It is true, indeed, that the people of the Southern States have a friendly feeling for the great railroad lines whose successful administration is so important to their growth and prosperity; but if only the railroad interest were involved they would not be found demanding this appropriation as earnestly as they do.

REMARKABLE BENEFITS.

I do not believe there is an appropriation contained in this act where the same amount of money accomplishes a larger amount of benefit to millions of people. I am amazed that the reformer, seeking to restore this Government to its pristine simplicity, purity, and economy, should run through our great annual appropriations of six or seven hundred millions of dollars and pounce on this little appropriation of \$171,000 in order to signalize his zeal and vigilance. Yet the debates on this paragraph have been protracted at every session of Congress since I have been in this Hall. A foreigner, sitting in our galleries, could hardly understand it, especially if he happened to see a bill appropriating a hundred and fifty millions of dollars rushed through after a debate of an hour or two. He would go home bewildered.

DISCUSSED FULLY.

This subject was fully discussed at the second session of the Fifty-third Congress, and among others by my colleague [Mr. ROBERTSON] and myself. In my brief remarks I referred to the appeals to continue this service coming up from the business men and commercial bodies of New Orleans and the whole country tributary to New Orleans. I stated then that these gentlemen had studied this question, knew their own interests, and that New Orleans was the second exporting city of the country. I pointed out the gain in time, and that we had two double fast mail trains from New York where we had one before. I also showed how, under the bill, the Postmaster-General regulated the schedules, and that these were regulated, not by the convenience and interests of the railroads, but by the public interests.

All these considerations apply with equal or greater force today.

It appeared in that debate that these appropriations for "special" facilities, which began as far back as 1875, had been kept up every year, and in a number of years had largely exceeded the appropriation which was then contemplated or the sum now to be appropriated. It was stated in debate that no Postmaster-General save Mr. Wanamaker had ever antagonized this appropriation. The Second Assistant Postmaster-General, Mr. J. Lowrie Bell, had reported (see RECORD of April 24, 1894, page 4045) that the present mail schedules were "improvements over those which have heretofore been enforced."

I think it safe to say that the present schedules are an improvement on anything that went before over this important artery of commerce and mail communication, although the amount appropriated is smaller than in 1894.

Mr. Chairman, it has been boldly asserted in this House in these discussions that the mail service to the South has not been expedited by this appropriation and the service established under it by the Post-Office Department. In other words, that the commercial men, the business men of the South, and these other citizens have been laboring under a delusion in this whole business; that as a body they are so ignorant that they do not know whether they are getting one or getting two mails per day, or whether they are getting them much more expeditiously than they used to get them, and that in the matter of forwarding their mails and transmitting letters to New York and the Eastern cities they ought not to form an opinion at all, but wait until they are told by some member of the House what is their real condition.

AUGMENTED MAIL SERVICE.

I think it requires a great deal of hardihood for a member to rise in this House and assert that the mail facilities of the people of the South and Southwest have not been greatly augmented over the former system.

In the second session of the Fifty-fifth Congress the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] stated that the time for a letter to come from New York to Danville (his own town) had been reduced from eighteen hours and fifteen minutes to thirteen hours and thirty-five minutes, a saving of five hours. The time to Atlanta from New York had been cut down from thirty-three hours to twenty-four hours and twenty minutes, a saving of about eight and one-half hours. The gain between New York and Tampa is about fifteen hours, and the whole Cuban mail goes that way. Such was the showing made for this improved service in March, 1898.

Mr. GAINES. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES. Have not the freight facilities been augmented also?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. GAINES. Have they been subsidized?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Some of them. The subsidy now in question aids the beneficiaries in increasing the speed of all trains.

In this same connection there was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 19, 1898, page 3005, an important letter from the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, Mr. Shallenberger, dated March 3, 1898, in which he gives a statement of the improvement in this special Railway Mail Service. It is a letter too long to be read here, but it deserves to be read, as throwing a good deal of light on this whole matter. I may, however, mention some of the points contained in this letter, which is in reply to specific inquiries made by the Representative from Virginia.

In the first place, on February 1, 1893, there were from New York for New Orleans two through trains—one a fast train, No. 35, taking about thirty-nine hours, the other, No. 11, a slow train requiring forty-eight hours for the trip.

Another table furnished exhibited the service in March, 1898, under the special-facilities appropriation gives the time of trains No. 35 and No. 37 from New York to all the points on the route to New Orleans, and also such points as Houston, San Antonio, Knoxville, Birmingham, Memphis, Savannah, and Tampa. There are two fast mail trains running to New Orleans instead of one, one being thirty-nine hours and forty minutes, the other thirty-nine hours and ten minutes. Mr. Shallenberger speaks of the "great improvement" in mail service by the establishment of the new schedule.

Secondly, Mr. Shallenberger testifies that the schedule of lines connecting with Washington and New Orleans railway post-offices have been so modified that all important lateral communications are made for the interior of the Southern States.

Thirdly, There was no train operated on the Washington and New Orleans route in July, 1893, which took up the connection at Washington from the New York and Washington "fast mail" railway post-office leaving New York at 4.30 a. m. "Train 35, however, does make this connection, and the mails are greatly expedited thereby. The mails affected thereby are those from New England, New York State, and Pennsylvania for the Southern and Southwestern destinations."

Fourthly, "Railroad companies receiving extra compensation out of the special-facilities appropriation are required to furnish a schedule satisfactory to the Post-Office Department, and the arriving and departing time so fixed can not be changed except by consent of the Department."

Finally, Mr. Shallenberger says that "the service between Washington, D. C., Atlanta, and New Orleans, La., and other Southern and Southwestern territory has been very materially improved and the delivery of the mails expedited since March, 1893."

I consider this statement so specific in details and so emphatic

as conclusive upon the point stated, namely, of a great improvement in our postal service owing to this appropriation.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. GAINES. The fact is, about nine months after that letter was written he stated—and it is incorporated in these hearings, as was shown by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL]—that these subsidies for the New Orleans trains are not necessary to get a fast train.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I understand General Shallenberger simply confirms the statement made by Mr. Grant, as quoted by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL].

Mr. GAINES. Here is what he says:

I would say that this paper, having been prepared by Mr. Grant from official data, is of course official and authoritative and to be preferred to any statement I could make from memory.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I prefer to rely upon the experience of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, who year after year iterated and reiterated favorable reports in the matter, rather than to depend upon a single statement. In short, it is safer to believe that Mr. Shallenberger was correct in his conclusions year after year for a period of seven or eight years, and perhaps wrong in one instance, than to suppose that he was wrong seven successive years and brought to a right state of mind by Mr. Grant.

Mr. Grant also cites the case of the Queen and Crescent road, which competes with the Louisville and Nashville road, a non-subsidized system that makes just as fast time without the subsidy as they did with it.

I remind you of the fact that the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company had this subsidy, as you call it, for a while and then threw it up as unprofitable. They were not willing to come up to the Department requirements. If it was a needless subsidy—a mere job—why did they throw it away? In this fact you have a pretty good indication of what we may have to expect if this appropriation be stopped. We shall have one fast mail and passenger train, perhaps, in twenty-four hours to New Orleans—what we used to have in old times. The whole country from Washington via Danville, Atlanta, Montgomery, and other points, with their lateral connections, will have to suffer the evils of a disarrangement of their mail communications and of a tardy, infrequent service.

Mr. GAINES. But that does not change the fact that the schedules of these roads when unsubsidized were just as fast as when subsidized. After the subsidy was withdrawn they did not change their running time from what it was before.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. My friend certainly knows that no railroad or other corporation would give up a subsidy of \$192,000 unless there was some disadvantage connected with it.

Mr. GAINES. But the remarkable statement is made here on this floor that other railroads do not want these subsidies and the people do not want them; yet the roads on this one route are asking them.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I never knew a corporation to reject a subsidy if it was in a condition to accept its terms profitably.

Mr. GAINES. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] have stated that Western roads—roads connected with the Kansas system—do not want these subsidies.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. But the fact remains that, while the Atlantic Coast Line gave up this subsidy, the Southern Railway Company would not take the contract previously held by the other line without it.

Mr. Chairman, to resume. Following the letter of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, there is a long and impressive statement, made by the officials of the Southern Railway Mail Service, which abundantly fortifies the positions of Mr. Shallenberger's letter.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE SOUTH.

I have no time to read it, but the critics who assail this appropriation, if they read it, ought to be able to see that they are striking a blow at nearly the entire mail service of the Southern States, at the business interests, as well as the happiness and convenience of millions of people.

I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that in the zeal to strike down this very small appropriation an effort has been made to show that the Post-Office Department is opposed to it and that the Department is authority for the statement that if this appropriation be withdrawn the eight or ten Southern States affected by it will still get as rapid and frequent mail communication as they have to-day. The Department has never put itself on record as saying anything of the kind. It has borne testimony, as I have shown you, to the great improvement in this mail service from New York, via Atlanta, to New Orleans, and to the fact of there being two fast mail trains per day where there used to be only one. In the extended debate had in the Senate some two years ago, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. SULLIVAN] quoted the Second As-

sistant Postmaster-General in reply to his specific inquiry whether the Department could secure the service as "prompt and frequent" without the so-called subsidy as with it. The response was:

I regret to say that I can not give a specific answer as to what we will be able to do. It is an open question.

It is true that the Post-Office Department has been willing to take chances on it. The people of the South, in the region I speak of—some ten millions of them—are not willing to take any chances. Their merchants, business men, and people generally are not willing to take any chances. They know a good thing when they see it or possess it, and they are just as anxious for speedy, frequent mail communication as the people of the North and East. Will you blame them for it?

It would have been a very extraordinary statement, indeed, if the Post-Office Department had reported that without this appropriation and authority they could have secured as prompt and efficient mail service for this Southern country as they have to-day. The answer would have been made at once. Why, then, have you been spending this money in the past unless you deemed the expenditure "necessary to promote the interest of the postal service?" The law made that fact a condition, test of the expenditure.

SOUTHERN CONDITIONS.

Again, we know that the railroads in the South are now under different conditions from those in the North. There are few large cities with us, and the country is sparsely settled. It does not pay to run fast passenger trains. To secure an additional fast mail train a day requires a special expenditure. The train starting from New York at 4.30 a. m. leaves at an hour when no passengers can be expected. They will naturally wait for the afternoon train.

This early train does, however, take the mails of New England, New York City and State, and all the mails over this long route are expedited.

There are few members in this House, from the East and North especially, who do not know the great value of time in the forwarding and reception of letters, and while their constituents may not be generally interested in this appropriation, many business men in the East will be apt to inquire how and why this appropriation should be singled out for special attack.

It is a melancholy fact that this contest should be renewed every year and that the people of eight or ten Southern States should be forced to fight for this slight recognition in the benefits of a common Government. It is somewhat in contrast with the policy which calls on the South thirty-five years after the close of the civil war to bear her share of the taxation involved in a grand pension system of \$150,000,000 per annum. The appropriation is called a "subsidy." That word does not frighten me at all. I am not afraid to vote for fair and just appropriations for all parts of the country.

There may be abuses, possibly great abuses, in your postal expenditures, but this is not one of them.

Mr. Chairman, my friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES], in his brief remarks during the course of Mr. BROMWELL's speech, seems to think that resolutions of boards of trade, of commercial and financial associations, and of State legislatures are of very little value.

Mr. GAINES. Did I say that they were not of any value?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I so understood the gentleman; at all events he attributes an ignorance of facts to them.

Mr. GAINES. I said that none of the bodies stated in their resolutions that they had any of the facts before them that we had before us to-day, and we have not had the facts before us heretofore that we have to-day.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have a higher opinion of the wisdom of State legislatures than my friend from Tennessee. The legislature of his own State unanimously passed resolutions in favor of this appropriation; and constituencies that send such eminent and able gentlemen as the Tennessee representatives to these Halls (and of which my friend [Mr. GAINES] is a distinguished exemplar) can certainly be relied upon to select judicious and capable men to their State legislature—men who would not act incautiously in so important a matter. [Applause.]

As for myself, I concede great importance to such memorials; they spring from sources that appreciate more fully than we can do in the abstract at this distance, the value and necessity of expedition in business and rapidity of intercommunication.

I beg leave to read a letter from the president of the Cotton Exchange of New Orleans, one of the great commercial bodies of this country.

NEW ORLEANS, January 21, 1901.

DEAR SIR: The vast interests of not only New Orleans but the route covered by the fast-mail service are of themselves self-evident. The total commerce of this city for the year ended August 31 covered 12,045,734 tons, valued at \$516,823,449. Our direct trade through Northern ports covered 4,713,099 tons. The latter does not embrace all of our dealings with the East, as hundreds of millions of dollars of exchange business is transacted between New Orleans and New York.

All of this emphasizes the necessity for quick communication by mail between this city and the East. Not only are we seriously interested in this matter, but so are nearly all of the great cities of the East with which and through which we trade.

I might go on multiplying facts and figures, but the foregoing are, I trust, sufficient to indicate the importance of continuing our mail facilities as they have been. If any change is made it should certainly be in the direction of increased time.

Yours truly,

S. P. WALMSLEY,
President.

Hon. ADOLPH MEYER,
Member of Congress from Louisiana, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, the most numerous mercantile organization in New Orleans is the New Orleans Board of Trade. Its membership numbers about 500 and embraces business men in all lines—bankers and merchants, manufacturers, and in all industrial pursuits.

It has a special committee on post route and mail facilities, composed of its most astute members, whose duty it is to promote and protect mail facilities. With your permission, I submit the following:

NEW ORLEANS BOARD OF TRADE, LIMITED,
New Orleans, January 23, 1901.

DEAR SIR: We thank you for your favor advising us of the threatened discontinuance of the fast mail service through the efforts to strike the appropriation from the bill.

This alarm arises every year or so, and we trust our efforts at present will prove as successful as previously. This matter is of vital importance to the entire section from New Orleans to Boston. No doubt the service involves some outlay on the part of the Government, but the many advantages more than compensate for that outlay. It has been claimed by those who oppose the appropriation that the railroads would continue the service in their own interest without any recompense whatever. This may or may not be the case. The service is of such considerable importance to this entire section that it is not desired to run any chances in the premises.

This fast mail service insures the maintenance of a fast daily train both ways. The route communicates at all points with other lines, and all parts of this section are brought into close communication with the North. The considerable shortening of time in handling foreign mails is a great consideration to this section, especially in the handling of commerce. The discontinuance of this fast mail service would not only work a hardship, but would prove of much injury to our commerce generally.

The service is considered of as great benefit and advantage to the Eastern States as it is to us, and therefore we feel that their Representatives in Congress could readily be prevailed upon to give their active support in retaining the appropriation, and the matter should certainly be placed before them in its true light with this object in view.

We sent you and each of our Representatives in Congress a copy of the resolutions adopted by this board.

Very truly, yours,

UDOLPHO WOLFE,
President.

Hon. ADOLPH MEYER, Washington, D. C.

NEW ORLEANS BOARD OF TRADE, LIMITED,
New Orleans, January 19, 1901.

DEAR SIR: The following resolutions were adopted by the New Orleans Board of Trade, Limited, and were approved by the other local commercial organizations of this city and the cooperation solicited of the other cities interested:

"Whereas the Board of Trade of New Orleans views with alarm the threatened discontinuance of the existing special fast mail service between New Orleans and the East through the possible failure on the part of the Committee on Postal Affairs to make provision for it in the general appropriation; and

"Whereas the loss of this service would work a great injury, not only to this city but to a great portion of the South and East; Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the New Orleans Board of Trade, Limited, enters its most solemn protest against this threatened retrograde movement, and respectfully and earnestly urges the Committee on Postal Affairs of the House to reinstate and continue the appropriation for this service as heretofore.

"Resolved, That the Louisiana delegation in Congress, who are fully aware of the importance of this service to our commercial prosperity, are urged to give this subject their undivided attention and support.

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the Louisiana delegation in Congress, and to the commercial exchanges of New Orleans, Mobile, Montgomery, Atlanta, Baltimore, Washington, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston for their approval and support.

"Resolved, That the various exchanges named be requested to telegraph at once to their Congressional delegations, urging prompt action."

UDOLPHO WOLFE, President.
HY. H. SMITH, Secretary.

Hon. ADOLPH MEYER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

I have before me other memoranda in regard to action by commercial bodies, editorials from leading newspapers, etc., indorsing the fast mail, the reading of which want of time prevents, to wit:

Certified copy of resolution unanimously adopted by the Tennessee legislature.

Memphis, Tenn.: Strong article in the Scimitar.

Huntsville, Ala.: Editorial, Huntsville Evening Tribune; article, Huntsville Daily Mercury, showing resolution adopted by Chamber of Commerce and city council; copies of resolutions of the mayor and aldermen; resolution of Chamber of Commerce.

Birmingham, Ala.: Copy of the resolution of the mayor and board of aldermen of the city; resolution of the Commercial Club of Birmingham; resolution of the Board of Trade of Birmingham; clippings from the Birmingham Age-Herald of January 19 and January 22, indorsing fast mail; clipping from the Birmingham News, January 22; clipping from the Birmingham Daily Ledger, January 22; editorial comment, Birmingham papers, January 20 and 21.

Brunswick, Ga.: Resolution of the Board of Trade.

Knoxville, Tenn.: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce;

resolution of the Commercial Club; clippings, Knoxville Journal-Tribune, January 20 and 21; clipping, January 22, showing action of commercial bodies of Knoxville and legislature of Tennessee; editorial, January 20, Knoxville Journal-Tribune; Sentinel, Knoxville, January 21, showing action of commercial bodies.

New Orleans: Notice of the Daily Picayune, January 19; notice in Daily States, January 19; editorial, Times-Democrat, January 21; notice, Times-Democrat, January 21, showing action of Board of Trade; editorials from following papers, January 23: Daily States, Daily Picayune, Times-Democrat; copy of telegram from president of the Cotton Exchange to members of Congress.

Columbus, Miss.: Citizens of Columbus, Miss., wired Senators MONEY and SULLIVAN asking them to support the appropriation. Senators wired they would use their utmost.

Mobile, Ala.: Copy of resolution of the Chamber of Commerce. Strong telegrams were sent by the secretary of the Mobile Chamber of Commerce to Senators and Representatives in Congress. Mobile Register of January 20 and the Daily Item and Herald showing notices. (Clippings not sent.)

Chattanooga, Tenn.: Strong editorial, Chattanooga Times, January 24, also January 25. Item in the Chattanooga News January 22. Chambers of commerce will act upon the matter this week.

Atlanta, Ga.: Strong editorial in the Constitution.

Montgomery, Ala.: Strong editorial and notices in the Montgomery Advertiser. Commercial Club of Montgomery passes strong resolution. (Copy of it was not sent to this office.)

Asheville, N. C.: Board of Trade of the city passes resolution in favor of fast mail.

These are only a minor portion of the notices.

DUTY TO SOUTH.

Mr. Chairman, in passing upon this question of a fast railway mail service for the Southern States, it is our duty to look at the situation presented to-day in that section of the Union. It is true that we do not have in the South large cities such as they have in the North and which force the railroads there to expedite their trains in order to secure business.

GROWING SOUTH.

But our cities and towns all exhibit a gratifying increase. This is especially the case in my own city of New Orleans. What is true of the towns and cities—of New Orleans, Galveston, Vicksburg, Memphis, Nashville, Mobile, and Atlanta—is also true of the Southern States in which they lie. There is a large, steady, and gratifying increase of the population.

The State of Louisiana so far exceeded the average rate of increase for the Union that she became entitled to an additional member of Congress under each of the two rival plans of reapportionment presented to us the other day. Such comparatively new and fertile States as Kansas and Nebraska did not present an equal increase with Louisiana, although they possess great resources and are located on great lines of railroads. For a long period after the civil war, depressed and discouraged by military rule, by reconstruction, negro and carpetbag ascendancy, the South made little or no progress. But as these evils were removed or mitigated the South began to put on a new life. The tree apparently dead began to put forth leaves and branches, and already we behold the fruit. Our cotton crop has been largely developed and for a year or two past the prices have been remunerative. Other crops have done well. The cotton seed once deemed useless has been converted into a most valuable product.

AGRICULTURE IMPROVED.

Every branch of agriculture has improved. Our mines of iron and coal have been developed and we now manufacture pig iron cheaper than any country in the world. We are making steel and selling it abroad. Both of these industries are yet in their infancy. There is hardly any limit to their respective growth.

NEW MILLS.

Cotton mills are going up every day. We are manufacturing coarse cottons cheaper than any other people in the world. Our mills are beginning to make the highest grades of cotton goods, and it is only a question of time when the South shall monopolize the cotton manufacture of this country and export these goods freely to other lands. [Applause.]

Many other kinds and forms of manufacturing industry are rapidly springing up. There is hardly one of them that can be mentioned in which the South does not possess equal or superior advantages to any other State of this Union.

SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY.

Shipbuilding, which has been regarded as exclusively a Northern industry, is now being actively prosecuted at Newport News and on the James River in Virginia. In this rapid forward movement of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce is it not clear to every intelligent mind that rapid, frequent mail's are an essential, necessary ingredient? This rapid communication between the South and the North and East is necessary to both—to all the country. [Applause.] To deny it would be a reproach and a scandal.

This, however, is only a part of the story. It is evident that we are on the threshold of a larger, greater commerce with South America, the West Indies, including Cuba, Mexico, and Central America, than ever before. All these countries are rapidly developing. They are attracting immigration, capital, and are about to improve their grand resources.

NICARAGUA CANAL.

The building of the Nicaragua Canal, now an almost assured fact, will give a special stimulus to this coming trade. Cuba, freed from the yoke of Spain, will exhibit fourfold activities. The South is, or will be, in close touch with all these countries. Your mails and your richest products must pass through her ports and gateways in order to reach these countries. Surely this is no hour for a narrow vision, a contracted policy, or a neglect of the agencies which stimulate commerce and enhance the wealth, power, and glory of our Republic. [Applause.]

I must not omit to state that this work of Southern rehabilitation and progress is mainly, almost exclusively, the work of our own sons. It is not the creation of Northern men or the result of foreign immigration. The immigrants from the Northern States or from Europe have followed the lines of climate. They have gone West. More of our sons have gone North and West than the number who have reinforced our ranks of labor and production. We have a right to be proud of this fact. We are paying our full share of the expenses of this Government. Our crops of cotton, tobacco, and other exports go far to swell your favorable balance of trade and bring back foreign gold. We pay heavily for appropriations in which we reap no benefit, and it is a very small return to allow this moderate mail appropriation, so important to our commerce, to remain undisturbed. [Loud applause.]

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, it was my intention to ask the House to close debate upon this bill at the conclusion of my remarks to-morrow. I did not open the debate on the bill, because I desired to accommodate some gentlemen who were obliged to go away. I would like to find out now, if I can, from gentlemen on the other side whether any more time is desired in general debate.

Mr. MADDOX. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURKE] has just left the House. He told me that he expected to speak to-morrow.

Mr. MOON. It seems to me that we require a little more time on this side for debate. My colleague [Mr. GAINES] desires a short time. Perhaps he is ready to go on this evening.

Mr. LOUD. I have no objection, if the gentleman [Mr. MOON] will yield to his colleague.

Mr. MOON. I yield to my colleague [Mr. GAINES].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has ten minutes.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, the right of petition was a right enjoyed by our forefathers before they came to America. When they came here as colonists they brought that right with them; and when it was denied they rebelled. When we framed our Constitution and the fundamental laws of this country we planted this right in those instruments. It is a natural right, and I have a great respect for the "right" and those who rightfully exercise it. There is no right that is more precious to the American people or to the human family than the right of petition.

Mr. Chairman, the legislature of the State of Tennessee has respectfully petitioned my colleagues and myself to vote for this subsidy. They have not stated in that petition a single fact which could have warranted the conclusion which they have reached, or which could persuade my judgment to indorse and grant the prayer of that petition. I am satisfied that the body from which this petition comes had not all the facts before them that we have here to-day, clear, plain, official, and conclusive. Nor has this Congress ever had the facts so plainly and so clearly before it as now. Nor has Congress ever had these facts before it before.

Mr. Chairman, I received that petition and respectfully and with pleasure filed it under the rules of this House. They will be found in the sacred archives of this great country when I have long since passed out of this honorable body and at rest in the shade of the trees beyond the river.

Mr. Chairman, I have given the same consideration to resolutions coming here from the chamber of commerce in Knoxville and Chattanooga that I have to the petition of the legislature. I have respectfully filed them all together. Not only the right to petition, but to remonstrate, is a right planted not only in the fundamental laws of this my native land, but is the law of the State of my nativity, whose constitution Thomas Jefferson said was the best he had ever read.

But, Mr. Chairman, with the facts of this case clearly before me as they have been exploited here to-day, clearly showing from the record before us that this subsidy is not necessary to secure proper mail service, what is my duty? Sir, not a single farmer, not a single merchant, not a single physician, not a single divine, not a single school-teacher, not a single individual of any class, has written me a letter upon this subject. In this situation, am I to sit here blind to the fact that this subsidy is not necessary, and must I forsooth vote for it because one of the railroads that is to get the

benefit from it runs into Nashville, my home? And when it is said here "the railroads do not want the subsidy," pray who does, then? Not the railroads; not the people. Who?

Why, what, Mr. Chairman, would a great judge sitting as a trial court say to a verdict brought in by a jury contrary to the evidence deposed by General Shallenberger and Mr. Grant and the evidence of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY], of the committee, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL], of the committee, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD], chairman of the committee, of the other members, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLEMING], and my colleague [Mr. MOON], also a member, all of whom say that this subsidy is not necessary and that the mail trains would make as good time without it as with it?

The gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD], whose integrity, knowledge, and courage no man in this House doubts, says the trains ran as fast into New Orleans before as since the subsidy. I read the hearings at page 456, volume 1:

Mr. LOUD. I make the statement that the trains made the same time before the subsidy was granted that they do now.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I will ask you that question. Did the unsubsidized trains make as fast time before the subsidy was granted, as to the Southern road, as they do now?

Mr. LOUD. I assert that they made the same time in December, 1892, that they do now.

That is, Mr. Chairman, December 1, 1898.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Well, I am asking for information.

"I am asking for information," says the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS], and he got it from a member of this committee, who has had years of experience in this investigation, and yet the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] here to-day urges this subsidy without disproving this and other undisputable proof. To do what, I ask? To make a train run as fast as it is already running, and, sirs, will continue to run without this subsidy, as the proof here shows, on pages 454-455, and no one dare to show facts—not dicta, but facts—to disprove.

Would a trial judge permit a verdict for a subsidy to stand for a single moment with such testimony as this given the jury? These gentlemen know the facts. Here are men who have investigated the matter thoroughly and for months and months. Can there be any doubt as to the propriety of following their judgment?

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to state that I have myself some testimony in connection with this matter that has never been fully put into the RECORD, and I shall be delighted to use it to-day, as it has governed me on former occasions in this matter. And more, I am glad to know that the Department itself has taken sides one way or the other in connection with this appropriation. There seemed to be some doubt as to its position and the official data, but now there is no doubt. In the Fifty-fifth Congress, when this matter came up, I was anxious to get at all of the facts, as I always am in connection with public matters on this floor.

I try to treat every measure, regardless of which side it comes from, with absolute fairness, seriously, conscientiously, intelligently, and patriotically, as far as I can, and use my best endeavors to obtain the fullest light upon every matter that is presented for our consideration before I act finally. And, Mr. Chairman, I was informed, when I asked General Shallenberger, with reference to this subsidy, if it was "necessary for the transportation of the mails"—I remember his metaphor, and can quote, I think, almost exactly the identical language—certainly the substance used in reference to it. He said:

When the tree was young it needed support. When the railroads were young we needed a subsidy to help them along. But the railroads have grown strong; they have reached a period when they can stand alone, when they have sufficient capital to support themselves, and we do not need the subsidy. The tree can stand alone.

He again said, also, "that we are getting as good service without the subsidy on certain railroads as with it;" and hence with that testimony before me in the Fifty-fifth Congress I have voted consistently against this measure, and the great governor of the State of Tennessee, who honors that State with an able administration of her laws, and is honored himself again by an overwhelming ballot of the great Democratic party he so ably served in this House, stood by my side here in this House and voted against this subsidy upon the same ground and upon the same information he had received and that I had received—that is, the testimony of General Shallenberger that this appropriation was not now needed, which is much less evidence of that fact than we now have with this report before us.

And further than that, Mr. Chairman, if gentlemen will examine the pages of the report which has been submitted by this special commission appointed to investigate postal affairs, what do we find? We find on pages 448 and 449 of the report that Mr. Grant is indorsed in his statement fully by Mr. Shallenberger. Mr. Grant says:

There seems to be no justification for the special-facilities payments, judging from results obtained. If we treated all lines on this basis, then we should pay the Northwestern Railroad for running an early morning train from Chicago (at 2.45 a. m.) to Fort Howard, Wis.; also for Cedar Rapids from Chicago.

We should also pay the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railroad for a

train leaving Chicago at the same hour, and running to Marion and the West; also the same road for a train from Chicago to Milwaukee and St. Paul; the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy for a train leaving Chicago at 3 a. m. and running to Burlington and Omaha; the Monon Route for a train leaving Chicago in the early morning for Cincinnati. The Illinois Central also has a train leaving Chicago about the same hour, as has also the Pittsburg, Fort Wayne and Chicago, and the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern. The Missouri Pacific runs a train out of St. Louis at 3 o'clock in the morning; so does the Iron Mountain; also the Baltimore and Ohio Southwestern; the Pennsylvania for Indianapolis and the East, and the Wabash for Toledo and the East. The Baltimore and Ohio Southwestern also runs a train out of Cincinnati about the same hour. The Cincinnati, Hamilton and Dayton also has a train out of Cincinnati at about 3 a. m. The Michigan Central runs a train out of Detroit about the same hour; so does the Flint and Pere Marquette.

From this it can be seen that the railroad companies can be induced to run trains at an hour not calculated to draw passenger traffic, but mainly for the interest of the mails. All of these early morning trains have been secured without special-facilities payments.

In 1893 the Department discontinued the special-facilities appropriation for the Atlantic Coast Line from New York, by way of Washington, Wilmington, Charleston, and Savannah, to Jacksonville, but Congress, without any recommendation from the Department, made an appropriation for improved facilities between New York and New Orleans, by way of Philadelphia, Washington, Charlotte, Montgomery, and Mobile. There is no question but that the service was improved between New York and New Orleans, but whether the improvements could not have been secured without the payment of special-facilities money is an open question. We can only judge by what has been accomplished in other directions.

In 1894 the Department secured a special fast mail on the St. Louis, Iron Mountain and Southern Railroad, leaving St. Louis at 3 a. m. and running on fast time to Texarkana, making connection with the Texas and Pacific, and thus reaching nearly all of the principal points in Texas. At that time the company was running two through trains daily, one leaving St. Louis at 10 a. m. and arriving at Texarkana at 8.15 a. m. the next day, the other leaving St. Louis at 8.15 p. m. and reaching Texarkana at 1.20 p. m. the next day. The new fast mail train left St. Louis at 3.05 a. m. and arrived at Texarkana at 9.30 p. m., and was clearly additional service. The speed of this train is about 30 miles an hour, including stops.

In 1890 the Illinois Central, at the solicitation of the Department, put on a train out of Chicago, leaving at 3 a. m., and running through to New Orleans. This train was in addition to service then operated, and was secured solely on account of the additional business which would accrue from the improved facilities. This train makes a speed of 36 miles an hour, including stops, from Chicago to Cairo, and 30 miles an hour, including stops, from Cairo to New Orleans.

As an evidence that special-facilities money is not necessary to enable railroads in the South to operate fast trains, I would cite the fact that the Louisville and Nashville Railroad maintains two through trains daily between Cincinnati and New Orleans, in addition to trains for local service. These through trains make a speed of 33 and 28 miles an hour, respectively, including stops.

The Queen and Crescent system, which competes with the Louisville and Nashville between Cincinnati and New Orleans, also runs two trains daily between Cincinnati and New Orleans, which are run at a speed of 31 and 32 miles an hour, respectively, including stops.

The Florida Central and Peninsular, which competes with the Atlantic Coast Line for Florida business, runs two through trains a day between Columbia and Jacksonville. The Atlantic Coast Line has not reduced its train service in consequence of the withdrawal of the special-facilities payments, but still maintains two through trains daily, in connection with the Pennsylvania and other lines interested, between New York and Jacksonville, and during the heavy business in the winter time puts on a special fast train in addition.

Mr. Shallenberger then says:

I would state that this was prepared by Mr. Grant for the use of the committee, as he informed me, and I would ask that it be filed as a part of my remarks.

So, then, as to these Illinois subsidies, they tell us that they have increased the mileage on this road to 36 miles an hour. Now, as a matter of fact, the Louisville and Nashville road have a train which runs at about as great a rate from Louisville to Nashville and has no subsidy, Grant says; and the same may be said of the Florida Central system. And there is another statement unchallenged and undisputed, to wit, that the Atlantic Coast Line has not reduced its special service in consequence of the withdrawal of the special subsidy. That road keeps up the service, in connection with the Atlantic Line from Pennsylvania—the Pennsylvania Railroad, which connects with it here—and throughout the winter season has a special train in addition for the accommodation of winter passengers to Florida.

So, I repeat, there can be no possible just ground for the continuance of this subsidy. And, Mr. Chairman, there is no longer any conjecture about it. We have heard a good deal said to-day about the effect of the withdrawal of the subsidy. My distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] need not doubt that this fast service will be continued if it is withdrawn. He must know that the Southern roads are operating on just as good a schedule as the subsidized road, and one of them has absolutely refused to reduce the speed of its trains after the subsidy was withdrawn. He must know that if this subsidy is withdrawn, the other road, by reason of competition, will have to keep up just the same character of traffic and the same kind of trains.

If they do not, of course, as a natural consequence, the business of the road will drift in other directions. And yet, because General Shallenberger can not swear positively that he could carry on, beyond each and every doubt, the service without this subsidy, we are to go on, year after year and year after year, and put our hands into the Treasury of the people, where the hard earnings of the people are piled up under unrighteous tax laws, and pay the railroads millions of their money for attending to their own business, even after they say they do not want the compensation and are able to do without it. Is there any justification for such a proceeding?

Mr. Chairman, are not the fast freight trains of the country, I would ask, running faster than ever before in the history of the country? Let us take those trains as an illustration of what we may expect if this subsidy bill shall fail of enactment.

Is there a man within the sound of my voice who will dispute that? I pause to allow any gentleman on the floor of the House to dispute the fact that the freight trains of this country run faster than ever before? [After a pause.] No one denies, Mr. Chairman. Nobody dare dispute the fact.

Now, the freight trains are not subsidized. Yet I am to be criticised because I exercise my God-given judgment upon the facts before me, simply because a few people of my great State, who have honored me far beyond my deserts, have said, as I contend without all if any of the facts, that they favor this bill; and even if they have the facts, I want to say they show, and the truth is incontrovertible, that this subsidy is not needed. The railroads do not want it. The people who sent me here have not asked for it, and in my judgment it should not be given. Therefore I feel it my duty to myself, that I may carry to my humble couch to-night, as I try to in reference to all my duties, a clear conscience, to vote against this measure. And I make this statement here in defense of the position that I have taken upon this floor consistently in the Fifty-fifth and Fifty-sixth Congresses. [Applause.]

And then, on motion of Mr. LOUD, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CANNON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the Post-Office appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles: when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 12513. An act to extend the privileges of the seventh section of the immediate transportation act to Saginaw, Mich.;

H. R. 10664. An act granting permission to the Indians on the Grand Portage Indian Reservation, in the State of Minnesota, to cut and dispose of the timber on their several allotments on said reservation; and

H. R. 8814. An act to provide for the entry of lands formerly in the Lower Brulé Indian Reservation, S. Dak.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

S. R. 142. Joint resolution to enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice-President of the United States, March 4, 1901.

OLIVER H. CRAM.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with a resolution of the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), I return herewith the bill (H. R. 10761) entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Oliver H. Cram."

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, February 5, 1901.

Mr. RYAN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the Committee on Enrolled Bills of the two Houses be authorized and directed to correct the enrolled bill of the House (H. R. 10761) entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Oliver H. Cram," by striking out the words "Oliver H. Cram" wherever they occur in the title and text and inserting "Orville H. Cram."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. RYAN of Pennsylvania, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. GRIFFITH, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Ruth A. Avery, Fifty-sixth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

And then, on motion of Mr. LOUD (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Commissioner of Patents, transmitting his annual report for the calendar year 1900—to the Committee on Patents, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation for expenses of International Convention for Protection of Industrial Property—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact in the case of A. P. Rutherford, administrator of estate of William Kountz, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact in the case of W. A. Collier, administrator of estate of Winfred Collier, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact in the case of J. G. W. Tompkins and J. C. Brown, administrators of estate of Rachael M. Tompkins, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact in the case of Nathan H. Whitlow against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact in the case of Miller Isbell against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting the annual report of the Washington and Marlboro Railway Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WANGER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13842) to authorize the Glassport Bridge Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River, in the State of Pennsylvania, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2664); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRICK, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13770) providing for the election of a Delegate from the district of Alaska to the House of Representatives of the United States, defining citizenship and the qualifications of electors in said district, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2665); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13962) to extend the time granted to the Muscle Shoals Power Company by an act approved March 3, 1899, within which to commence and complete the work authorized in said act to be done by said company, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2666); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9153) granting the right of way to Alafia, Manatee and Gulf Coast Railroad Company through the United States light-house and military reservations on Gasparilla Island, in the State of Florida, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2703); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2489) to provide for the further distribution of the reports of the Supreme Court, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2704); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KERR of Ohio, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4550) providing for an additional circuit judge in the Second judicial circuit, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2705); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MERCER, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9709) to provide for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a municipal building in the city of Washington, D. C., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2706); which

said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bills of the House (H. R. 3724 and H. R. 8855) authorizing the purchase of a site for the accommodation of the Supreme Court of the United States, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 14064), accompanied by a report (No. 2707); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1730) granting an increase of pension to Alfred H. Jones, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2667); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5409) granting an increase of pension to John W. Phillips, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2668); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2401) granting a pension to Maggie Black, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2669); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5675) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Holmes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2670); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRIGGS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10007) granting a pension to Blanche Duffy, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2671); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5428) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Cole, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2672); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8333) for the relief of Mrs. Annie S. Hummel, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2673); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5451) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Hyde, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2674); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13586) granting a pension to Milton Phillips, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2675); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 648) granting a pension to Margaret G. White, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2676); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13585) granting a pension to Nancy Cate, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2677); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13794) granting a pension to Hix Patterson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2678); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5170) granting a pension to Louise Wolcott Knowlton Browne, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2679); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8080) granting a pension to Mrs. Elcy Bennett, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2680); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8891) to increase the pension of William Rheuby, reported the same with

amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2681); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11902) granting a pension to William K. Hoffman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2682); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13814) granting a pension to John B. Wilson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2683); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3580) granting an increase of pension to Theron Johnson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2684); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8537) granting a pension to Mary Ann Merrow, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2685); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13895) granting an increase of pension to Dr. E. M. Kanouse, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2686); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4731) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta M. Leiper, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2687); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5074) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Bridges, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2688); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13926) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Moulton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2689); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13925) granting a pension to Richard Howell, alias George Carroll, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2690); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13924) granting a pension to Jane Johnson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2691); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 413) granting a pension to Albert S. Cummings, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2692); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CONNER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13402) granting a pension to William W. Plank, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2693); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13699) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. F. Seabury, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2694); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SHAW, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13747) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Schram, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2695); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5431) granting an increase of pension to William H. Ball, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2696); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5326) granting a pension to Maggie Alice Brady, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2697); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6500) granting a pension to Elisha T. Bisbee, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2698); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which

was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14015) granting a pension to Alexander Gossett, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2699); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 248) for the relief of Winslow Warren, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2700); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11659) to pay claimants for goods and effects lost or destroyed by fire at Ellis Island, New York, on June 15, 1897, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2701); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12596) for the relief of Mrs. Julia L. Hall, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2702); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 14038) to revive and amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pittsburg and Mansfield Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SALMON (by request): A bill (H. R. 14039) to grant the right of way to and authorize the Union Electric Construction Company to build, own, and operate in and through the District of Columbia an electric railway—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MERCER, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds: A bill (H. R. 14064) to provide for the purchase of a site for and the erection thereon of a court of justice building for the accommodation of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 300) canceling the license of certain traders on the Osage Indian Agency, in Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MERCER: A resolution (H. Res. 408) providing for consideration of bills reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GAINES: A joint resolution of the legislature of Tennessee, favoring a public building at Springfield, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a joint resolution of the legislature of Tennessee, favoring the fast-mail subsidy—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOREING: A bill (H. R. 14040) granting a pension to Martha Maddox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14041) granting a pension to George W. Ingram—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14042) granting an increase of pension to Kephart Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14043) granting an increase of pension to Perry F. Belden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14044) granting an increase of pension to Sophia Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 14045) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. Philpott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 14046) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Brittingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAHLE: A bill (H. R. 14047) to provide compensation for injuries received by George E. Giles, of Watertown, Wis., at the Ford's Theater disaster, which occurred June 9, 1893—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 14048) for the relief of William Vincent—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 14049) amending the record of Howard W. Seager—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JETT: A bill (H. R. 14050) granting an increase of pension to Joel J. Warren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 14051) for the relief of Margaret Myers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14052) for the relief of the personal representative of the estate of Alexander Myers, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 14053) granting a pension to Mary Dittenbaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 14054) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bliss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 14055) granting an increase of pension to George W. Bush—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 14056) granting a pension to Vincent Daucer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 14057) for the relief of John Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14058) for the relief of William J. Wilcoxson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN of New York: A bill (H. R. 14059) granting a pension to Mary Weiss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 14060) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Brewster—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 14061) for the relief of Wolfe Abrahams—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 14062) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo Weeks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 14063) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Simpson Coplin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 14065) granting a pension to A. J. De Wolf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of internal-revenue gaugers, storekeepers, etc., of the Twenty-third collection district of Pennsylvania, asking for an increase of pay—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the First Presbyterian Church of Canonsburg, Pa., for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the First Presbyterian Church of Canonsburg, Pa., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOREING: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Perry F. Belden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Sophia Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of George W. Ingram—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Kephart Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRICK: Petition of citizens of Mishawaha, Ind., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Peter Turner and other letter carriers, in favor of the letter carriers' salary bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Petitions of E. E. Kauffman and M. B. Fleck, of Lancaster, Pa., favoring uniform marriage and divorce laws, anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution, and certain other measures—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKETT: Resolutions of the physical science department of the Nebraska State Teachers' Association, in favor of the establishment of the national standardizing bureau—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, resolutions of the National Board of Trade, in favor of House bill No. 887, relating to the Philadelphia Commercial Museums—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: Petition of the American Baking Powder Association, in behalf of the Brosius pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Pasteur Vaccine Company, of Chicago, Ill., opposing the free distribution of medicinal remedies—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Henry Funnell, of Clifton, Kans., for the repeal of the duty on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petition of the Rhode Island Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring the passage of the Gillet bill for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petitions of R. L. B. Clark and Joseph Tayel Theresa, delegates to the Republican convention of 1856, in favor of the erection of a monument to John C. Fremont—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the

National Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill No. 887 in behalf of the Philadelphia Commercial Museums—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of New York: Resolutions adopted by a joint committee of 18 commercial organizations of the city of New York, urging better postal facilities in that city—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the National Board of Trade, for such legislation as will strengthen our maritime position—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of the National Board of Trade, advocating the passage of House bill No. 887, in behalf of the Philadelphia Commercial Museums—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of Group 7, New York Bankers' Association, advocating the repeal of war taxes on checks, notes, drafts, and other bills of exchange—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOWLER: Petition of the Civics Club of Orange, N. J., favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAINES: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Knoxville, Tenn., asking the Speaker of the Fifty-seventh Congress to give Tennessee representation on the Rivers and Harbors Committee—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, sundry petitions of the Chamber of Commerce of Nashville, Tenn., favoring the enlargement of the work of the Geological Survey so as to include mapping of forest regions in Southern and Eastern portions of the country, and certain other measures—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GILBERT: Petition of the internal-revenue gaugers, storekeepers, etc., of the Fifth collection district of Kentucky, for sufficient appropriation to provide for their vacation without loss of pay—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Rev. J. S. Ferguson, of Keokuk, Iowa, in behalf of the National Association of Union Ex-Prisoners of War, in support of House bill No. 12461, favoring pensions to soldiers confined in Confederate prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Connecticut, Cornelia B. Forbes, president, urging the passage of House bill No. 12551, for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HITT: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of William Vincent—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACK: Petition of 125 citizens of Manor, Pa., urging the banishment of the liquor traffic in Africa—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. JOY: Petition of Lucas Avenue Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of the anti-polygamy amendment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Lucas Avenue Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of St. Louis, in favor of ratification of treaty which aims at the banishment of the traffic in alcoholic liquors from a great part of the continent of Africa—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Lucas Avenue Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of St. Louis, in favor of House bill No. 8497, known as the Littlefield bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Lucas Avenue Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of St. Louis, for protection against Sunday traffic, etc., in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Lucas Avenue Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of St. Louis, favoring uniform marriage and divorce laws, and certain other measures—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENTZ: Petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Delaware, Ohio, favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Northwestern Steamship Company, of Chicago, Ill., relating to the passage of the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Jacob Rehm and other citizens of Chicago, Ill., favoring the improvement of the Calumet River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McALEER: Petition of the National Board of Trade, in behalf of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Three papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Charles R. Van Trees—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: Papers in support of House bill granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bliss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'GRADY: Petition of tobacco manufacturers of Rochester, N. Y., relating to the tax on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Berea, Ohio, favoring uniform marriage and divorce laws, and certain other measures—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Petition of citizens of Binghamton, N. Y., asking for the abolishment of the traffic in liquor in Africa—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of citizens of New York City, N. Y., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIXEY: Paper to accompany House bill No. 2244, for the relief of the Episcopal Church at Remington, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Rev. J. A. P. McGaro and 26 others, of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging the passage of a measure providing a permanent supply of live water for irrigating purposes for the Pima and Papago Indians in Arizona—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Petition of the internal-revenue gaugers, storekeepers, etc., of the Second collection district of New York, for sufficient appropriation to provide for their vacation without loss of pay—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of the National Board of Trade in favor of House bill No. 887, to make appropriation to complete collection of foreign trade samples and to provide for gathering information on same in connection with the Philadelphia Museum—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of citizens of South Lyon, Mich., favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPERRY: Remonstrance of citizens of Middletown, Conn., against the passage of House bill No. 12743—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Protest of citizens of Wichita Falls, Tex., against the parcels-post system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, protest of citizens of the Indian Territory against the passage of the Flynn bill, dividing the Territory into counties—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Resolutions of the physical science section of the Nebraska State Teachers' Association, favoring the passage of House bill No. 11350, to establish the national standardizing bureau—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. TONGUE (by request): Statements containing charges against ROBERT W. WILCOX, Delegate from Hawaii—to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 6, 1901.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. HALE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

SEACOAST BATTERY AT MILITARY ACADEMY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War submitting a supplementary estimate of appropriation under "Buildings and grounds, Military Academy," for the construction of emplacements for a modern seacoast battery for the instruction of cadets, \$167,000; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD PRODUCTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Industrial Commission, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 26th ultimo, a review and digest of the testimony concerning the adulteration of food products, together with a separate digest of certain additional evidence relating to baking powder, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed.

WASHINGTON AND MARLBORO RAILWAY COMPANY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington and Marlboro Railway Company; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13491) authorizing the Mount Carmel Development Company to draw water from Wabash River at Grand Rapids, Wabash County, Ill.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Enrolled Bills of the two Houses to correct the enrolled bill of the House (H. R. 10761) granting an increase of pension to Oliver H. Cram, etc., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (H. R. 8814) to provide for the entry of lands formerly in the Lower Brulé Indian Reservation, South Dakota;

A bill (H. R. 10664) granting permission to the Indians on the Grand Portage Indian Reservation, in the State of Minnesota, to cut and dispose of the timber on their several allotments on said reservation;

A bill (H. R. 12513) to extend the privileges of the seventh section of the immediate-transportation act to Saginaw, Mich.; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 142) to enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice-President of the United States, March 4, 1901.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented the petition of T. A. Shafer and 79 other citizens of Hagerstown, Ind., praying for the enactment of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petitions of Tabor Ham and 154 citizens of Mishawaka, J. L. McKinney and 19 other citizens of Terre Haute, and of Dr. W. E. George and 16 other citizens of Indianapolis, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. QUARLES presented a petition of the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association, praying for the enactment of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Fruit and Produce Exchange of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the repeal of the war-revenue tax on bank checks; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Stuart Reid Lodge, No. 300, International Association of Machinists, of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the hours of daily labor of workmen and mechanics, and also to protect free labor from prison competition; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Boston, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DOLLIVER presented a petition of the Farmers' Institute of Delaware County, Iowa, praying for the enactment of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry business firms of Des Moines, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a minimum tax of 1 per cent on bucket-shop transactions; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of A. M. Whetzel and sundry other citizens of Guthrie Center, Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Mrs. G. G. Wheeler and sundry other citizens of Burt, Iowa, and the petition of Rev. DeWitt White and sundry other citizens of Crawford, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors to the native races in Africa; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FRYE presented the petition of H. R. Watson, of Tarrytown, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to limit the hours of daily labor of workmen and mechanics, and also to protect free labor from prison competition; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Taos, N. Mex.; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Anadarko, Okla., and of the Massachusetts Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors to the native races in Africa; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE NAVY.

Mr. HALE. I present certain communications from the Secretary of the Navy, each distinct by itself, transmitting some figures with reference to the cost of ships and force of men employed in the Navy. I move that each communication, with the accompanying paper, be printed as a separate document, and that the statement compiled from letters to Congress from the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, and other sources relative to the present need of the Navy for additional